AN

ACCOUNT

OF

Mr. *CAWDRY'S*

Triplex Diatribe

Concerning Superſtition, Wil-worſhip,

AND

Chriſtmaſs Feſtivall.

By *H. Hammond* D. D.

LONDON,

Printed by *J. Fleſher*, for *Richard Royſton* at the *Angel* in *Ivy-lane*, and for *Richard Davis* Bookſeller in *Oxford*. 1655.

A *Preface* to the READER.

1. THat Mr. *Cawdrey* hath taken great pains to ſhew me the infirme parts of *three* little Tracts of *Superſtition*, *Will-worſhip* and *Feſtivals*, I am now obliged to take notice, and to deſign the vacancy of a few days to clear thoſe brief diſcourſes from all the *miſpriſions* and *exceptions*, to which ſome contrary *hypotheſes* of his (how true ſhall in due place be examined) more then the want of *evidence* in the *Tracts* themſelves may have rendred them *liable*.

2. What on the *two* former heads I wrote many years ſince, I confeſſe, I expected not to ſee arraigned at this time, being deſigned as part of an ἐιρωικὸν or διαλλακτικὸν, which might help to repaire the *breach*, at leaſt mollifie the *Paroxyſme*, by removing two of the *five* ſpecious *charges*, under which the blameleſs *ceremonies*, and *cuſtomary practices*, and *obſervances* of the *Church* of *England* were by diſſenters *oppugned* and rendred *odious*. And what was then ſaid, as I could not diſcern wherein it came ſhort of *Evidence* of *conviction* (if I had, I ſhould certainly either have *cleared* or *ſuppreſt* them) ſo it was never my fortune in *nine* years ſpace to hear from any, that it lay under an ill *character*, but on the *contrary*, that it had in ſome meaſure performed what it undertook, freed our *Church* from thoſe *two* accuſations, and *demonſtrated* them, as applied to us, to be perfect *calumnies*. And I have but one *Petition* to the *Reader*,

at his entrance on these debates, that he will calmly review those *two* Treatises, with *three* more designed to the same end, and upon his strictest *survey* advertise me, wherein I have *failed* in my undertaking.

3. But it is come to passe, what *Arrian* long since taught me to expect, that as when *general discourses* come to be applied to *particular* cases, τότε ἡ μάχη γίνεται, *then the contention begins*, so when the grounds, more *universally* laid for the *justifying* our *Church*, were in a *tract* concerning *Festivals*, and especially the day of the *Nativity* of *Christ*, brought home to the clearing that *celebration* from either of those two (as from all other) charges, then Mr. *Cawdry's hypotheses*, in which, I suppose, his way of managing his opinion of the *morality* of the *Sabbath* had engaged him, found themselves to be concerned, *then* the *commemoration* of the *birth* of *Christ*, though but by one *anniversary* (being not easily reconcileable with the grounds which he had laid for the *Christians one weekly Sabbath* in the 4th *Commandment* of the *Decalogue*) was solemnly to be *indicted* and, as in a *Chancerie bill*, all imaginable evill to be affixed on it, and the customary *riot* of *festivities* being not sufficient to render it *odious*, the more *formidable* charges of *Will-worship* and *Superstition* must be revived, and by the necessity of this *consequence*, to salve his φαινόμενα and δυλεύειν ὑποθέσει, all that I had said on either of those two *subjects*, though never so *clear*, must now be called to a *severe examen*, and so store of new tasks provided for me.

Arr. Epict. l. 1. c. 22.

4. And me thinks tis possible that old * *Nahum's* word גם זו לטובה *even this also for good*, To which purpose I am willing to remember what *Alexander Aphrodisæus* told the *Emperors Severus* and *Antoninus*, in his Preface to the *Tract* of *Fatalitie* and

Elias Lev. Thisb. p. 49.

and *Free will*, that whosoever would point him out any *doubt* or *difficulty*, that remained in that matter, after the reading of his *treatise*, he would account it a great *favour* and *honour* to him, rendring this reason for it, because it was not easy ἐν ἑνὶ βιβλίῳ *in one Tract*, to do *two* things exactly, both *dilucidely* to *expound* the matters of which he principally wrote, and all those other things also, which were *usefull* to the *explicating* thereof.

5. And the same I desire may introduce my address to this *Diatribist*, and the tasks by him set before me, The subjects which he hath chosen to consider with me being such, as well deserve some *care* from each of us, that we neither *deceive* others, nor our selves in them, I mean, perfectly *practical*, concerning a peculiar *Christian duty* incumbent on us, in that of *Festivals*, and again a more *universal* duty, that of *obedience* to our immediate *Superiors*, and to the *universal Church* of *Christ*, from which we must not depart or be affrighted, upon pretense of *Superstition* &c. and yet ought warily to secure our *obedience* from that and the like guilts, when there is any *real* danger of them. And beside these, there is somewhat of a more *sublime* consideration, (on occasion of that of *Will-worship*) the *freewill offerings* which will very well become a *Christian* to bring to *Christ*, *rewardable* in a *high* degree, though they are not under any *express precept*, such are all the highest *charities*, and *devotions*, and most *heroical Christian practises*, which shall all not onely be *degraded* but *defamed*, if every thing be concluded to be *criminous*, which is not *necessary*, if all *uncommanded* practise be *unlawfull*.

6. Now this *Diatribist* having undertaken to *examine* what I then wrote, and done it with so little *partiality* to me, that I have no reason to suspect he hath left any

minute difficulty unmentioned, I shall hope that the descending to a *particular survey* of all his *objections* will probably prevent any *future* mistake in these matters, and upon this score, as St *Augustine* thought it *necessary* for those *heathens* which *deified* all their *benefactors*, to build one *altar* and pay some *homage* to their *enemies*, because they deserved to be numbred among their *benefactors*, so have I not grudged the *tribute* of my *pains*, at least that of a ready, though *laborious obedience* to this call of the *Diatribist*, but apprehended this *opportunity* of removing all *doubts*, which can recur and require solution; entertaining my self with some *slender hope* that the *Reader* may reap some *small benefit* thereby in order to *christian practice*; the one thing which I desire to propose, as the *end* of all my *meditations*, and never to be drawn by the importunity of those which differ from me in opinion, into any *contention* or *ingagement*, which hath not this aime visible before it, the *seasonable checking* and *reformation* of some *vices*, (such sure are those which here I desire to *prevent* and *remove*) or the *confirmation* and *increase* of *virtue*, to the *glory* of *God*, and the *multiplying* of *fruit* to our *account*.

7. That this hath been the onely aime of all hitherto *publisht* by me, even of those discourses which are most *polemical*, I am so fully satisfied in my self, that I doubt not to approve it to any, that can make question of it, where *difference* of opinion doth not either by *close consequence*, or more *immediately*, lead into *vitious practice*, I shall never willingly *contend* with any man, or make reply to the *contentious*: But in *Doctrines* which have *immediate influence* upon *practice*, tis *obligation* of *charity* to indevour the *disabusing* of all, and not to permit or suffer any such *fruitfull*, and *noxious error* upon my *neighbour*.

Under

8. Under which head becauſe I cannot but place the *rejecting* of *Children* from *Baptiſme*, and find ſome *objections*, offered by Mr. *Tombes*, to what I have written on that *ſubject*, I have therefore drawn a ſhort *defence* of that *Apoſtolical* practice, and vindicated my *former* diſcourſe from his *anſwers*, and *exceptions*, which being offered to the *Reader*, as ſoon as the *Printer* will permit, I ſhall not doubt of his leave to ſhut up the *Palæſtra* at this time, having ſufficiently *cloyed* him with theſe *Spectacles*.

9. And it is my wiſh for him that he may continue to have the *eaſe* (at leaſt) of a *Spectator*, that it may be his lot, though for ſome moneths it hath not been mine, εἰρηνεύειν καὶ ἡσυχάζειν, to live *peaceably* and *quietly* with all men, a felicity of which we are all to be *ambitious*, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, and a *grace* that we are all, not in *prayer* one- 1 Theſſ. 4. 11.
ly, but by *real* indevours to contend for, and to *hold* it *faſt*, untill it be violently *wreſted* from us.

10. As it is, I have with *patience* fortified my ſelf for the *preſent* undertaking, and to make it alſo as ſupportable as may be to *others*, abſtained from *tranſcribing* the entire ſeverall *Sections* of his *Diatriba*, and onely repeated as much as *exacts anſwer* from me, not omitting (as far as my *wit* would ſerve me) any the *leaſt* particular, which can be thought to have *energy* againſt any of thoſe things, that are aſſerted by me in thoſe *Tracts*, ſave only when the ſame things once *anſwered* have again, whether in *words* or *ſenſe*, been *repeated* by him.

THE

THE
Contents of the ſeverall CHAPTERS and *Sections* contained herein.

CHAPTER. I.

OF Mr. C. his Title Pages. page. 1

Sect. 1.

Philoſophy Col. 2. 8. *Fables and endleſs Genealogies,* 1 Tim. 1. 4. Tit. 3. 9. *The propriety of that Text* Col. 2. *to* Mr. C. *his diſcourſe.* 1

Sect. 2.

Mat. 15. 8, 9. Gal. 4. 9, 10. *Deum ſic colere quomodo ſeipſum colendum præcepit.* Chriſtmaſs no irrational cuſtome. 3

CHAP. II.

Of Mr. C. his Preface. P. 4

Sect. 1.

His diſcourſe of the cauſes of my miſtakes. Comparing of Superſtition and Wil-worſhip to Hereſie. Accounting Superſtition our virtue. 4

Sect. 2.

Of being too Religious; of the intenſion or degree. The Meſſalians, Neglect of Charity, of particular callings, Eccl. 7. 16. *Of multitude of Ceremonies. Too many Ceremonies no argument of too much, but of too little Religion.* 6

Sect. 3.

Mr. C. his diſtinctions of being too religious, multiplied unneceſſarily. Frequency of duty, if ſecured from other neglects, no

no excesse, nor criminous. Prayer a branch of Natural worship, θεῖος πόθος. *Excesse in trust, &c. as well as in Prayer. The Species of worship, and the circumstances thereof. The wide difference between these. Times of Prayer not limited by Scripture: Set days of worship, Gestures, Prostration. Mr. C. his 3. proofs examined,* Deut. 4.2. *considering* Apoc. 22.19. *A view of* Aquinas's *doctrine in this matter.* 8

Sect. 4. *Excesse of Religion. Super statutum. Addition to the Rule. Doctrines.* Δεισιδαιμονία, Act. 17.22. Act. 25.29. *Six concessions.* Superstitiosus. *Worshipping of Angels.* Superstitum cultus. *Slavish fear. Religion in* Epicurus. *Fear of punishment in sons; in wicked men. The necessity thereof. Dogmatizing. Placing more virtue in things then belongs to them.* 20

Sect. 5. *The innocence of Wil-worship. Analogie with voluntary oblations under the law. Seeming Contradiction. The authority of* Chrysostome *and* Theophylact. *The* 2d. *Commandment. Reducing all sins to the Decalogue. Addition to the rule, Worship of Angels. Other sins beside that of Dogmatizing.* 32

Sect. 6. *The Lawfulnesse of instituting the Christmass Festival. Of Church Laws.* 38

CHAP. III.

Of Superstition peculiarly. And first of his Prolegomenon on that Subject. p. 41

Sect. 1. *Answer to* §. 1. *The method used to find the meaning of the word.* 41

Sect. 2. *Answer to* §. 2. Amesius's *definition. The matter of the 4 first Commandments. The affirmative part of the* 2d. *Commandment. The Diatribist's misadventure about Duty in the midst. No prohibition of either holy days in the* 4th *Commandment.* Jeroboams *act,* 1 Kin. 12. 32. *The Rubenites altar,* Josh. 22. Naaman's *altar. Christmass Festival parallel to it. The excesses in each Commandment.* 42

Sect. 3. *The species of Superstition. Idolatrie belongs to the* 2d. *Commandment. Superstition to the first. It differs from Wil-worship. The meaning of Illegitimate worship in Aquinas. His opinion of Ecclesiastical rites. Barbarous ceremonies of Baals worship belong not to the* 2d *Commandment. Holy days before*

Popery. Two ancient Testimonies for them. The Jews scrupulosity in not resisting on the Sabbath day. 49
Sect. 4. *The Diatribist's method and caution in setting down the species of Superstition.* 53

CHAP. IV.

Of the particular exceptions of the Diatribist to the Tract of Superstition P. 55

Sect. 1. *Confidence of innocence no argument of guilt.* 55
Sect. 2. *The nature of the word. Excess of fear among the Epicureans. Superstitio from Super and sto, not statuo: Aquinas misreported.* 56
Sect. 3. Δεισιδαιμονία *among the heathens for Religion, so in Hesychius and Phavorinus.* 58
Sect. 4. *False worship is not Wil-worship. Imposition of hands.* 59
Sect. 5. Δεισιδαιμονέστεροι. Act. 17. 22. (*The Athenians the most devout of all the Greeks.*) 60
Sect. 6. Ζητήματα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας Act. 25. *Festus's scorn fals on the Jews, not on* Paul. Τῆς ἰδίας *his own, not theirs.* Ζήτημα *and accusation. Jesus put under the notion of a* δαίμων *by Festus.* Ἀνάστασις *taken for a damon.* τεθνηκότος. ἔφασκε ζῆν. *The Diatribists objections answered. Superstition for Religion simply.* 62
Sect. 7. *The method of search for the original notion of the word.* Mr. Cawdries *collections from the heathens. Among them Superstition all one with Religion. Plutarch of the Sabbatick rest. Sacrificing children to Moloch, was not to the true God,* Jer. 32. 35. Lev. 20. 2. *nor a bare uncommanded worship. The glosses of the Etymologist and Phavorinus.* 66
Sect. 8. *Superstition always ill, but not always excess. Probations from the use of words among heathens. The Quare of Divorce vindicated. Superstitions not reprocht in the Romans by* Polybius. *Ignorance not presently Superstition.* Ἀγνοοῦντες ἀπεβεῖτε, *Act.* 17. The *Israelites worshipping the Calfe.* Δεισιδαιμονέστερος ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. *Superstitiosus noting excess.* 70
Sect. 9. *The Diatribist's concession of the innocence of unprescribed ceremonies, and so of all that is demanded. His censure of himself and Chamier. Authority in a Church to institute Ceremonies.*

remonies. Abstaining from ceremonies, because commanded by men or abused by Papists. 77

Sect. 10. *Strictures on some particulars in the remaining Sections. What excess Divines mean by Superstition. What S.* Augustine. *Obligation to performance, without being parts of worship. Observers of order more Religious, more acceptable then others. The reason why Jewish ceremonies are interdicted. The Church of England sparing in ceremonies Ceremonies not foreshewing Christ lawful to be retained by Christians. The abstinence from bloud, long continued in the Church. The Saterday Sabbath. Negative wholesomness not sufficient to recommmend ceremonies. All folly in worship is not Superstition. The opinion of the antient Church worth considering. No duties appointed for the circumstances sake. Time or place instituted by God is a circumstance, as well as when by man. Apostolical Divine.* 82

Sect. 11. *A Vindication of the Tract of Superstition from uncharitableness.* 88

CHAP. V.

Of Will-worship. p. 92

Sect. 1. *The state of the Question. Wil-worship distinguisht from the circumstances of it. The matter of mans will of three sorts. The 6. several possible notions of Wil-worship. The application of them to the matter in hand. The vanity of the Diatribists distinction. The scope of the 2d Commandment.* 93

Sect. 2. *The method of explicating difficulties in the new Test:* Θρησκεία *in a good sense: and when in a bad, no prejudice to* ἐθελοθρησκεία. 99

Sect. 3. *His entrance on the view of* Col. 2. *answered. The difference betwixt Commands of Magistrates and imposition of dogmatizers. What 'tis which is said to have* λόγον σοφίας. 101

Sect. 4. *The Magistrates power acknowledged. Inventing new ways of worship.* Davids *appointing the Levites to waite from 20. years old, an act of a King, not of a Prophet.* Davids *last words.* 104

Sect. 5. *Col.* 2.22. εἰς φθορὰν. Ἀπορίαι. δογματίζεσθε. στοιχεῖα κόσμου. *Placing worship. Christian liberty. Marriage. The Glosses put on the commands of men.* 107

Sect. 6. *The Diatribist's way to make the Doctors words witness against him.* Τί δογματίζεσθε κατ' ἐν τάλματα &c. *Placing worship, an equivocal phrase.* 112

Sect. 7. *Of Petitio Principii. Of* Λόγος σοφίας *being capable of two rendrings.*

drings. The danger from mistake on the Diatribists side. My interpretation not singular. His no way probable. Μέν *a particle of extenuation, no* ἀπολογικόν. *No shew of wisdome in respect of the folly that is in it. The Wil-worship parallel to the humility. The prime argument for my interpretation.* Σοφίας *for piety, vindicated from the contrary proofs.* φιλοσοφία, *Worship of Angels. No agreement betwixt* Col. 2.18.& 23. *or betwixt* 23 & 1 Cor. 2.4. Ἅπτα μὲν δὲ. 114

Sect. 8. *The abstinences how taught by the Gnosticks. Their pretenses for them, no realities. Abstinences may be freewill offerings, and self-denyals. Such may Fasting duely qualified. Such may virginal Chastity.* Pauls *judgement of it.* Chrysostome *of things* ὑπὲρ ἐντολὴν. *Abstinences positive acts. And yet, if negative, may be acceptable. These abstinences not commanded.* 122

Sect. 9. *Compliance with Papists. The Diatribists inconstancy.* 125

Sect. 10. *A reply to his answer of my two first reasons for the good sense. Humility and Wil-worship associated, either both real or both pretended. Popish laniations why culpable.* Σωματικὴ γυμνασία 1 *Tim.* 4. πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, ἐν ὀλίγῳ, ἐπ' ὀλίγον. *Fasting a* Λατρία *far from hurtful or abominable, wherein the profit of it consists. The true sense of* 1 Tim.4.8. *wherein the ilnesse of it consists.* Ἄσκησις *and* βδελυρία. *Abstinence because of abuses. For Religion. Marcionites. Durand. A shew of Piety in Wil-worship. All shew of good in respect of somewhat that is good. The Diatribists fallacious instances and questions.* 127

Sect. 11. *The Greek Fathers acception of* ἐθελοθρησκεία. *An argument of goodness that 'tis pretended by hypocrites. Religion in a good sense. Wil-worship not worse then false worship, not abominable. All devised worship is not Idolatry, doth not pretend to more wisdome then Gods. The Latin Fathers cited by Mr.* C. *The vulgar Translator, and the followers thereof.* Δογματίζεσθε *by the vulgar rendred decernitis. The authority of* Bellarmine *and* Daillé *for the good sense. The testimonies out of* Ambrose, Theodoret, Salmeron, Estius, Augustine, Thomas, *examined.* 139

Sect. 12. *The fifth reason vindicated.* Ἐθελοθρησκεία. *Hesychius corrected twise.* Ἐθελοντὴν *adverbially.* Ἐθέλημος. Ἐθελοκωφῶν. Ἐθελοπρόξενος. *Hesychius's Glossary concordant to the Scripture use.* Εὐστραπελεία, Eph. 5. 4. 149

Sect. 13. *Mr.* C. *His distinction of voluntary. Spontaneous. A work of love. The Testimony of Socrates. Worship true or false. Nothing unlawfull which is not forbidden. Voluntariness no way forbidden. The second Commandment.* 153

Sect. 14

Sect. 14. *The first occasion of mistaking* ἐθελοθρησκεία *for ill. The vulgar translator and Mr.* Calvin. *The Diatribists three exceptions to this shewed to be of no force. Wil-worship distant from Superstition.* Θρησκεία *onely in a good sense among Christians. Three mistakes of the Diatribist. All uncommanded is not forbidden.* 155

Sect. 15. *The second occasion of taking* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in an ill sense vindicated. The design of the Treatise of Wil-worship, onely for ceremonies, not for new kinds of worship. Whether all ceremonies be forbidden, which are not commanded. The various reading of* Philostorgius. *Sitting at the Gospel forbidden.* Chrysostomes *Testimony.* Τετραθηρον *not* τετράθυρον. θεῖος θεσμὸς *for Ecclesiastical Canon.* pilpeophunga *Will-worship.* 159

Sect. 16. *The third occasion of the mistake cleared. Worship of Angels forbidden, not onely not commanded. The reviving Judaical worship not called Wil-worship,* Col. 2. 23. *Maimonides's words wrested to a distant sense by the Diatribist. Original of Angel-worship. Vain worships. Clemens confounding of* Col. 2. 18. *with* 23. *Worship of Angels &c. a forbidden Wil-worship. The imposing of virginity and abstinences, as from God, the onely crime, found fault with by S.* Paul *and the ancient Catholiks.* Alcibiabes *his using, and remission of austerity. The like of* Spiridion *and* Marcianus. Cyrill *of meats.* 1 Tim. 5. 23. *explicated.* 163

Sect. 17. *The last occasion of the ill sense.* ἐθελοπρισοθρησκεία *in Epiphanius. Of the Pharisees appellation.* Περισσόν. *Dogmatizing and discriminating. Epiphanius's words cleared. Wherein their hypocrisie consisted.* Ἑκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, 1 *Mac.* 2. 42. *Asidei* חסד ἑκουσιασμὸς *turned into* ἀνάγκη, *the fault.* 169

CHAP. VI.

Of Free-will offerings. P. 173

Sect. 1. *The use of them in this question. The Diatribists discourse of them. His* Κρησφύγετον. *The Leviticalness of spontaneous offerings asserted by him, in order to denying them among Christians. Arguments against this conceit. Allowance of days as well as of worship among the Jews. Allowance acknowledged by the Diatribist to be as good as commands.* 173

Sect. 2. *A first instance of uncommanded Pieties,* Davids *intention to build the Temple. Vindicated from the three answers of the Diatribist.* 181

Sect. 3. *A 2d instance and that under the New Testament.* Paul's *taking no hire from the Corinthians; This, no action of common life, nor yet a due debt.* Καταχρήσασθαι *for using,* 1 Cor. 7. 31. 1 Cor 9. 17. *explained. The authority of* Augustine, Chrysostome *and* Theophylact. 184

Sect. 4. *The third of* Paul's *going up to Jerusalem: this under no precept. No refusing to suffer, no retarding of the Gospel. The example of* Christ *and* S. Paul *at other times, the testimony of* Origen, *and confession of the Diatribist.* 188

Sect. 5. *The fourth of more liberal almesgiving. Sadduces and Asidei, Righteousness, Mercy.* Paul's *advice without command.* 2 Cor. 8. 2. *The Diatribist's answer satisfied. Almes the Christians sacrifice in the offertory. Allowance no command. A latitude of degrees in the middle rule. The Apostles direction of giving as God hath prospered. Of the circumstances of giving.* 191

Sect. 6. *The fifth instance vindicated. Circumstances of Prayer acknowledged free. Difference between placing worship in gestures,* &c. *and pleasing God by them. So in Festivals.* 197

Sect. 7. *Of the difference betwixt a precept and a grace. The proportionable return to grace is in a latitude. The highest no excesse. A possibility for grace to be given in vain.* 198

Sect. 8. *My answer to a first head of objections vindicated. Prudence lost by mans own sin recoverable by grace. The punishments of* Adams *sin are not our faults. Perfection of innocence capable of degrees. So perfection of the Judaical law, and of the Christian, So mercifulness to ability.* Ὑπὲρ δύναμιν ἀυθαίρετοι 2 Cor. 8. 3. *Merciful as God is Merciful belongs not to the degree. Gods righteousness punishes not where there is no law. Intuition of reward in Christian performances, no Popery. Proofs of this from Scripture, from the nature of Hope, Faith, Gratitude. Not always prudent to undertake the highest. Martyrdome no conceited Popish perfection, yet under no precept to all.* S. Hieroms *words examined. Two notions of the word Perfection. Some perfection possible in this life, and yet capable of growth. The law, as it signifies the condition of the first Covenant, is not now in force with believers. Of Christs perfecting the law. Every man is not bound to do what is best.* 1 Cor. 7. 3. 8. καλῶς ποιεῖ *of moral good. The saying of* Gregory *explicated.* 202

Sect. 9. *My answer to a second sort of objection, vindicated. Loving God with all the heart.* Adam's *love in innocency capable of degrees. Perfect love that casts out fear, to be had in this life. Christ more intense in prayer at one time then another, an argument that all is not sinne that*

is leſs then the higheſt. 221
Sect. 10. *My anſwer to the laſt objection, of Supererogation. A place in S.* Cyprian *vindicated from the Romaniſts reading. Impunare. An act of mercy in God that our works are rewarded. Supererogation wherein it conſiſts. The Diatribiſts etymology of the word diſproved. Erogare. Erogatio. The Diatribiſts ways of Supererogating. Pride, Glorying. More reward for eminent uncommanded excellencies ſuperadded to duty. The Diatribiſts charity, and confeſſion of it. His cenſure of the Biſhops unjuſt.* 223

CHAP. VII.

Of Chriſtmaſs and other Feſtivals. p. 231

Sect. 1. *The obſervance which is due to the Cuſtome of a Church. The Teſtimonies of* Ambroſe *and* Auguſtine, *and* Iſidore. 231
Sect. 2. *Heathen adherents a proof of the firſt Antiquity.* 233
Sect. 3. *Of* Creſcens *coming into* France, *and* Simon Zelotes *into* England. *The difference of keeping* Eaſter *in the* Weſt *and* Eaſt. *Teſtimonies for our converſion in the Apoſtles times, Before King* Lucius. *The* Diatribiſts *ſuggeſtion diſproved.* Britain *not converted from* Rome. 235
Sect. 4. *The keeping of* Eaſter *in the Apoſtles times.* Polycrates's *Epiſtle to* Victor. *The* Aſiatick *way from* Philip *and* John. *From* Philip *derived to* Britanny. Ἐορταζομεν. Κυριακὴ. *The teſtimony of* Socrates *againſt Feſtivals, examined.* 241
Sect. 5. *Midwinter-day. The Winter Solſtice.* Julius's *Calendar.* 246
Sect. 6. *Feſtivals not* Romiſh. *The primitive Churches pure from the hereſies that ſollicited them. The* Romiſh *corruptions not fetcht from them.* 247
Sect. 7. *The grounds why this Feaſt may not be aboliſht among us. The Diatribiſts miſtake of the queſtion.* 249
Sect. 8. *The Reformation in this Kingdome. No imperfection in it in point of Feſtivals. The States joyning in it no diſadvantage to the Church.* 252
Sect. 9. *The* Lutheran *Churches accord in this.* Momeys *wiſh. The* Helvetian *confeſſion.* Rivets *cuſtome of preaching on the day.* 254
Sect. 10. *Ejecting feſtivals. Separation from the pureſt times, even thoſe of the Apoſtles. Our Churches departure from* Rome *unjuſtly paralleld with the departure of ſons from our Church.* 255
Sect. 11. *The profaneneſs objected to the Feſtival. Caſting out the Creeds.* 257
Sect. 12. *The Diatribiſts change of my words, his cauſleſſe praiſe of himſelf, and cenſure of others.* 259
Sect. 13. *His* 2d *change of my words.* Gedeons *golden Ephod not appliable to Feaſts.* 260

Sect. 14.

Sect. 14. *Strictures on his* 16th *§. Our Festivals unfitly compared with the Romish. How observation of Festivals may be a duty of the* 5 *Commandment. The fourth Commandment no way contrary to Christian Festivals. Venial sinnes. All mistakes not sinnes. Chemnitius not producible against me.* 261

Sect. 15. *Of riot. Christian joyes no way contrary to our Festivals. Riot as separable from Christmas as the Lords day. Heathen customes cannot be objected. Gods judgements vainly urged for arguments. The charge of want of hospitality on those that retain festivities. The hospitality at Christmas a pledge of it all the year after. Reformation of excess without abolition of the Festival. Attempt to reform, previous to abolition. The Agapæ no example for abolishing Festivals. Cures for diseases, excisions only for desperate spreading evils. No cards on Christmas day, as much strictness on Christmas, not more sacredness then on the Lords day. No design of making the Lords day no institution of the Apostles. Neither Superstition nor hypocrisie in abstaining from cards on Christmas day.* 265

Sect. 16. *Christmas, if of the same original with Easter, certainly Apostolical. However, of the practice of the Primitive Church. All rendring of motives no λόγῳ οὐσίας.* 275

Sect. 17. *The encænia, a religious feast instituted by the Jews, and approved by Christ, vindicated from all his exceptions. Marriage feasts. Religious feasts cannot be unlawfull, if civill be lawfull. The feast of Purim a religious feast.* 277

Sect. 18. *How the comparison holds between the Lords day and Christmas day. Institution, usage Apostolical for Festivals. No law in Scripture for the Lords day.* 283

Sect. 19. Aerius's *heresie that Festivals are unlawfull. S.* Augustine's *testimony added to* Epiphanius's. *The Diatribists inconstancy. The testimony of the Church of* Smyrna, *an evidence of keeping the days of the Apostles martyrdome, The Testimony from the martyrdome of* Ignatius *according with it. Testimonies for the antiquity of Festivals.* 286

Sect. 20. *Strictures on §.* 35. *The author of the Constitutions a competent testifier when in accord with others.* Justinus's *edict for Festivals reconcileable with the Apostolical usage of them. The* 20000 *slain by* Diocletian *on Christmas day. Objections against the* 25. *of December answered. The controversie in* Chrysostome *about the day, not the Feast.* Ἀρχαῖα ἀνωθεν. *His words full for the Apostolicalness of both.* 289

Sect. 21. *The Diatribists answer to my conclusion. Strictures on some passages in it.* 292

A N

AN ACCOUNT OF THE 3ex DIATRIBE CONCERNING *Superstition, Wil-worship,* and *Christmas Festivall.*

CHAP. I.

Of Mr C. his Title Pages.

Sect. 1.

Philosophy Col. 2. 8. *Fables and endlesse Genealogies,* 1 Tim. 1. 4. Tit. 3. 9. *The propriety of that Text* Col. 2. *to* Mr. C. *his discourse.*

AND first the *Title page* will deserve a *cursory* view, especially the place of *Scripture*, wherewith he hath chosen to *adorn* it, *Col.* 2. 4. 8. by which the *Reader* is directed to look on his *threefold exercitation* (as he is pleased to call it) *with Dr. H.* as an especiall *antidote* against that *Philosophy*, &c. of which S. *Paul* forewarns men to *take heed* in those two *verses.* *Numb.* 1.

On this occasion I shall not need inquire, what provocation Mr. C. had to express such *unkindness* to, and *jealousie* of *Philosophy*, (certainly not the same that S. *Paul* then had among his *Colossians*) but onely remind the *Reader* what is * elsewhere shew'd more largely, that the *Philosophy* there branded by the *Apostle*, was that which the *Gnosticks divinity* was too full of, taken out of 2.

* *Annot. on* Col. 2. a. and 1 Tim. 1. a.

Pythagoras and the *Greek Poets*, *Antiphanes*, *Heſiod* and *Philiſtion*, and eſpecially *Orpheus* his *Theologie* or *Genealogies* of the *Gods*, and ſo promiſcuouſly ſtyled by the *Apoſtles* φιλοσοφία καὶ κενὴ ἀπάτη, *Philoſophy and vain deceipt*, in this admonition to the *Coloſsians*, and μύθοις καὶ ἀτελεύτοις γενεαλογίαις *fables and endleſs genealogies* (how out of *Night* and *Silence* comes forth *Chaos* &c.) in his directions to *Timothy* 1 *Tim.* 1. 4. and μωραὶ ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίαι, *fooliſh queſtions and genealogies*, in his *Epiſtles* to *Titus* c. 3. 9.

3. And then how conveniently this was accommodated to any, or all thoſe *three* diſcourſes concerning *Superſtition*, *Wil-worſhip*, *Chriſtmas Feſtival*, muſt be diſcerned by his anſwer to all, or any of theſe few queſtions, 1. Whether any *Gnoſtick* principle of *Theologie* hath been diſcovered in any of thoſe *three Tracts* which he hath undertaken to chaſtiſe. 2. Whether it be a piece of *Apoſtatical* or *heretical pravity*, a branch of *heatheniſme* or *Gnoſticiſme*, to maintain the celebration of *Chriſts Nativity* to have nothing criminous in it, either under the head of *Superſtition* or *Wil-worſhip*. 3. Whether all *inſtitutions* of the *Church*, though in themſelves never ſo *blameleſs*, are yet to be lookt on, as συλαγωγίαι acts of *diſpoiling Chriſtians*, and little leſs then *Sacrileges*, and whether they are all comprehended under that ſtyle of *Traditions* of *men*, and *rudiments* of the *world*, in *oppoſition* to κατὰ Χριστὸν, *after Chriſt*, of which the *Apoſtle* ſo carefully warnes the *Coloſsians*. Laſtly, whether all *probable*, or *concludent*, nay even *demonſtrative* diſcourſe, be to be warded and averted, as *deceipts* and *beguilings*, becauſe capable of that title of πιθανολογίαι, which the *Apoſtle* there uſeth, whether we render them literally *probabilities* of *ſpeech*, or with our *tranſlation*, *inticing words*?

4. When M. *C.* hath accommodated any ſatisfactory *anſwer* to theſe *few* queſtions (all, or at leaſt ſome one of them) he may then be qualified to attempt juſtifying the *charitableneſs* of his *title page*, and the *propriety* of his *ſelect Scripture*, but till then, he may give his *Reader* leave to *queſtion* one of them.

Sect.

Sect. 2.

Mat. 15. 8, 9. Gal. 4. 9, 10. *Deum ſic colere quomodo ſeipſum colendum præcepit.* Chriſtmas no irrational cuſtome.

THe ſame reaſon I have to put in my *exceptions* to the *title pages* of his two other *exercitations*, and in like manner, 1. to demand, how commodiouſly the words of *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 15. 8, 9. condemning their *worſhip* as *vain*, which *teach for doctrines the commandments of men*, are affixt to the ſecond *Diatribe* concerning *Wil-worſhip*, when he cannot but know, that that *Text* is particularly handled in the firſt *leaf* of the *treatiſe* of *Wil-worſhip*, and demonſtrated neither to belong to *humane laws* in *general*, nor to any *inſtitutions* of the *Chriſtian Church*, but onely to the *dogmatizing* of *Phariſaical hereticks*, and particularly their urging ſome inventions of their own, as *commanded*, and under *obligation* by *divine* precept, now when the very *Judaical commanded* rites were ſo ſuddenly to be laid aſide, *nailed* to the *croſſe*, ſolemnly *cancelled* and *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*. *Numb.* 1.

And 2. (no farther to demand his reaſons, but) to admire his *conſtancy* to himſelf; that before the *Diatribe* of *Chriſtmas*, and other (ſure *Chriſtian*) *feſtivals*, he hath thought meet to prefix that *text Gal.* 4. 9, 10. of *obſerving dayes, moneths, times, years*, ſo peculiarly reſtrained by all *circumſtances* to the *Judaical Sabbaths, New Moons, Anniverſaries*, and *Jubiles*, but no more appliable to the *prejudice* of the *yearly* feaſt of *Chriſts birth*, then to the *weekly* of his *Reſurrection*. 2.

To which we ſhall *aſſociate* his two *Latine ſentences*, the one out of *S. Auſtine* of *worſhipping God as he hath commanded*; the other out of *S. Cyprian*, of the *vanity of irrational cuſtomes*, and remind him that we deſign no other *worſhip* of *God* upon *Chriſtmas* day, but ſuch as we are ſure he hath *commanded* at *all* times, that of *prayer* and *thankſgiving* &c. and that the *incarnation* of *Chriſt* was a competent *reaſon* to found a cuſtome of *commemorating* it after this manner, we ſhall finde a perfect *harmony* and *conſent* in all his *diſcords*, and that is all I ſhall return to his *frontiſpices*, 30

designed to infuse *prejudices* into the *Reader*, to *blast* before-hand, what he meant to answer.

Chap. II.

Of M. C. his Preface.

Sect. 1.

His discourse of the causes of my mistakes. Comparing of Superstition and Wil-worship to Heresie. Accounting Superstition our virtue.

1. THis now more then time that we think of *entring*, and yet there is a *Preface* still behind, which expects to be taken notice of, as being a very friendly *recapitulation* of the *grounds* of my great *mistakes*, the unhappy *causes* of those my *miscarriages*, which he hath discovered in the insuing *Exercitations*.

2. But I that am not yet by all his *Diatribe* so *instructed*, or improved, as to discern one real *misadventure* in those discourses, find it impossible for me to be *edified* by this his *charity*; I must be shewed my *disease*, before *Hippocrates* himself can point me out the *causes* of it, and therefore my briefest return to his *preface*, is but to beseech him to reserve his discourse of *causes*, till the *effects* shall be so *visible*, as to call for it; and if this be not a sufficient *reply* to *all* of it, What is behind, will easily be referred to this one *head*, the *injustices* and *mistakes* of the *author* of it, which I shall but briefely recite to him.

3. *First*, that he hath thought fit to compare *Superstition* and *Wil-worship*, as they are the subjects of my discourses, with *Heresie*; whereas, 1. *Superstition*, in the proper notation of the word, which first I speak of, and *vindicate* our *Church*, whether in the *ceremonies*, or *observances*, from all appearance of guilt of it, is the *worshipping* of *Demons* or *deified men*, and that sure is *worse* then *heresie* in every *Christians* account, and so inconveniently *compared*, so as to be *equalled* with it. And 2, whatever our

Church

Church hath admitted, is cleared to have nothing of *Superſtition* in it in any other *ſecundary notion* or *acception* of the word; or if it had, yet as long as it is no more but *uncommanded Rites* or *Feſtivals*, which by the *Diatribiſt* himſelf are thus ſtyled, thoſe ſure, in any *reaſon*, will not be capable of this *compariſon*, or *accuſation* of being ſo *bad* as *hereſie*; and 3. *will-worſhip* in the one place where it is uſed in *Scripture*, hath no manner of *ill*, but *good* character ſet upon it, being joyned ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ with *humility*, which I hope is not yet condemned to be quite ſo *criminal* and *abominable* to *God*, as *pride* and *hereſie* is acknowledged to be; however in this *Preface*, before my interpretation of *Col.*2.23. hath been endevoured to be confuted, this ſo eminent *criminouſneſs* thereof was not with more *reaſon*, then *charity* ſuppoſed by him.

2. That he hath affirm'd, in a *parentheſis*, of ſome men that they account theſe (and *ſuperſtition* is evidently one of theſe) *their virtues rather then crimes*; which again if applied to me, or I think to any *Proteſtant* living, is very *unkind* and *unprovoked*, having no *ground* in any part of my *Diſcourſe*. 4.

3. That *Wil-worſhip* hath been by himſelfwhere demonſtrated to be as *criminal* as *Hereſie*, which in what notion ſoever he hath expreſt himſelf to underſtand the word, is with no truth aſſumed by him, as far as refers to theſe *Diatribæ*; and if it be elſwhere attempted, 1. He ſhould have referred us thither, if but to *vindicate* his own *veracity*, or elſe have recited the heads of ſuch *demonſtrative arguments* in this place; or in the ſecond *Diatribe*; and yet neither of theſe are done by him. 5.

Sect. 2.

Of being too Religious; of the intension or degree. The Messalians. Neglect of Charity, of particular callings, Eccl. 7.16. *Of multitude of Ceremonies. Too many Ceremonies no argument of too much, but of too little Religion.*

Numb. 1. HIS *fourth mistake* is, that he hath recited it as one cause of my *miscarriages* in this business, that I *affirm that a man cannot be too religious*, and that I attest this both of the *intension* or *degree*, and of the *extension* or *number* of *Ceremonies taken into the worship of God*] Whereas that which I affirm, is evidently this; 1. That in respect of the *degree*, there is no such thing as *nimiety* or *excess* in *Religion*; no *possibility* of being *Religious in too high a degree*, Sect. 33. and this is not denyed by Mr. *C.* nor can be by any pious man; who knows that all his *faults* are
2. *omissions* and *defects*, but never *excesses* of *piety* or *religion*. 2. The main objections imaginable against this, from the practice of the *Messalians*, or the neglect of the *duties* of *charity* and the *particular calling*, incident to the *intense* practice of holy duties, were foreseen and prevented there; the *Messalians* fault was not their *excessive* practice, but their laying that *obligation* on themselves and others; the same that *Tertullian* and the *Montanists* were guilty of, in respect of other *austerities*, and so 'twas their *dogmatizing*, in their *imposition* of heavy *burthens*, wherein their *heresie* (not their *superstition*) consisted: And the others crime is his *idleness*, and walking ἀτάκτως *disorderly*, a crime censured by the *Apostle*, 2 *Thes.* 3.11. (yet far enough from *Superstition* again) and in like manner his want of *charity*, and so not *nimiety*, but *unseasonableness* of *piety*, contrary to the express words of Christ, *I will have mercy and not sacrifice.*

3. And if yet a third *objection* be offered from the words of the *Preacher*, *Eccl.* 7.16. (which yet this *Diatribist* hath not thought fit to offer) *Be not righteous overmuch, why shouldst thou destroy thy self?* I suppose the *answer* is obvious, that those words are the intimation of the *wordlings objection*, who taketh that for *excess* of *duty* which brings any *damage* or worldly *destruction* upon

upon him, and is anſwered in the *next* verſe with this ſolid *Aphoriſm* of eternal verity, *Be not thou overmuch wicked; why ſhouldeſt thou die before thy time?* The *fears*, and from thence the *prudential*, but oft times very *impious* practices of the worldling are far the more probable path to the moſt haſty *ruines*.

And ſo ſtill this branch of my doctrine, as far as aſſerted by me, was neither *untruth*, nor *miſcarriage*, nor cauſe of either in my *diſcourſe*. 4.

5. As for the ſecond, that of the *extenſion* or *number* of *rites* and *ceremonies taken into the worſhip*, that there cannot be *too many* of them, is as far from being my *aſſertion*, as that which is moſt *contrary*. For upon that head my *concluſion* is, that as ſome *rites* or *circumſtances* of *time* and *place* and *geſture* are abſolutely *neceſſary* to *Religion*, and the *ſignificativeneſs* of them is no manner of *prejudice* to the *uſe* or *inſtitution* of them, ſo if the *Diſputers* will yield but this, that even when they are *ſignificative*, the uſe of *Ceremonies* may be allowed among *Chriſtians*, I ſhall then in ſtead of pleading for the *multitude* of ſuch, give my vote to the confirming the old *Rule*, that they be *pauca & ſalubres*, *few and wholſom*; and particularly *few* for five reaſons, ſet down in the following words, *Sect.* 39. and ſure that is contrary enough to his reporting of my *opinion*, that there *cannot be too many* of them, and ſo that which was no part of my *belief*, could be no cauſe of any *miſcarriage* of mine in that *buſineſs*. 5.

6. To which if I ſhall now add, that my granting there ought to be *few* (and ſo that there may be *too many*) *Ceremonies* in a *Church*, is no way the yielding a *poſſibility* that a man may be too *religious*; but on the *contrary* when the *too many Ceremonies* either *cauſe*, or *occaſion*, or are accompanied with *inward neglects*, there is not *too much* but *too little Religion*, too much *formality*, but too little *devotion*, too much *outward Phariſaical waſhing*, but too *little inward Chriſtian fervor*, as there may be πολυλογία and βαττολογία, words too many, but too little *praying* (I may adde too many offers of *proof*, but too little *reaſon*) and remind the *Diatribiſt* that this was expreſly ſaid before in the end of *Sect.* 39. by the token of the *inſectile animals*, whoſe want of *blood* cauſed their multitude of *legs*, I ſhall then ſure have given him ground of *conviction*, that there were more then one *calumnie* 6. *Mat.* 6.

in

in his *aſſignation* of the *cauſes*, particularly in this of the *firſt cauſe* of my *miſcarriages*.

Sect. 3.

Mr. C. *his diſtinctions of being too religious, multiplied unneceſſarily. Frequency of duty, if ſecured from other neglects, no exceſs, nor criminous. Prayer a branch of Natural worſhip,* Θεὸς τίμα. *Exceſs in truſt, &c. as well as in Prayer. The Species of worſhip, and the circumſtances thereof. The wide difference between theſe. Times of Prayer not limited by Scripture: Set days of worſhip, Geſtures, Proſtration. Mr.* C. *his* 3. *proofs examined,* Deut. 4.2. *conſidered.* Apoc. 22.19. *A view of* Aquinas's *doctrine in this matter.*

Numb. 1. AS for his *diſtinctions*, by which he is willing to clear his way, that a man may be ſaid to be *too Religious*, *either becauſe he gives more to God then he deſerves, but ſo he cannot be too Religious*; or, *becauſe he gives more then God requires by the Rule of worſhip.* 2. *That in regard of worſhip commanded, eſpecially natural worſhip, a man cannot be too religious in reference to the intention* (I ſuppoſe it ſhould be *intenſion*) *of the devotion, as in love, fear, truſt in God* (adding in a cautious *parentheſis*, that *in inſtituted worſhip a man may be too religious, as if he pray or faſt to the waſting his health or neglect of his calling:*) *but in uncommanded worſhip, the leaſt addition to the Rule of worſhip is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious.*] I cannot imagine how he hath by either or both of theſe attain'd his end, but rather *perplexed*, then *cleared* the *way* for the *Reader*, which was perfectly *ſtraight*, and abundantly *explicate*, before he took upon him to be the *harbinger*.

2. For 1. the two latter *members* of both his *diſtinctions* are directly the ſame, and ſo I am ſure there was *too much* of his *diſtinctions, tautologie* I ſuppoſe is ſuch a *nimicty*, and ſuch ſure is this [*A man that gives more then God requires by the rule of worſhip is too religious*] and [*in uncommanded worſhip the leaſt addition*

to

to the rule of worſhip is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious.]

Secondly, for his *Parentheſis*, it was perfectly prevented in the *tract* of *Superſtition* § 33. and ſo was a 2d. *nimiety*, being added without all *neceſſity* or *uſe*, it being there acknowledged that in a *frequent* or *intenſe* practice of *holy duties* there might be ſome incident *fault*, viz. neglect of *duties* of *charity* or *particular callings*; and *waſting of health* through *faſting* immoderately, bears *analogie* with theſe. 3.

But then it was *forewarned*, that the *fault* herein was not the *exceſs* of *Religion*, but *omiſſion* of other *neceſſary duties*, and that demonſtrated by this, becauſe if that *frequency*, whether of *prayer* or *faſting*, wherein is the ſuppoſed *exceſs*, be either in *another* man, or in that man (whoſe *exceſs* is accuſed) at *another* time, *ſeparated* and *ſecured* from thoſe *neglects*, or *omiſſions* of thoſe other *duties*, the very ſame *frequency* and *intention* were his *virtue* not his *crime*, which therefore ſtill *prejudges* this from being an *inſtance* of the thing in hand, *that a man may be too religious.* 4.

Thirdly, his *difference*, in this reſpect of *nimiety*, betwixt *natural* and *inſtituted worſhip*, is perfectly vain and uſeleſs to his *deſign*, even as he himſelf hath explicated it, placing *love*, *fear*, *truſt in God* under the firſt head, and *prayer* and *faſting* under the other. 5.

For 1. I muſt remind him that *prayer* is as properly a branch of *natural worſhip*, as *love*, or *fear*, or *truſt* can be imagined to be, being, 1. inſeparable from *truſt*, 2. a *neceſſary* and *natural* means of acknowledging *Gods fulneſs* and our *wants*, 3. containing under it *thankſgiving*, *praiſing God*, which is the prime way of *honouring God* (*He that praiſeth me honoreth me*, ſaith *David*) and ſure that *honouring* of *God*, a moſt peculiar branch of *natural worſhip*, dictated by the *nature* of a *creature*, and taught by all *naturaliſts* that acknowledged any *God*, (Θεὸς τίμα, in the *Pythagorean* verſes, *honour the Gods*, and Θεὸν *God* in *Phocylides*) and both the *petitory* and the *Euchariſtical* comprehended under the Θεὸς σέβειν, *worſhiping the Gods* in *Plutarch*, which *Xenophon* tells us πᾶσι ἀνθρώποις νομίζεται *is the primeval law acknowledged among all men*, and *Hierocles*, having defined *Piety* to be the πασῶν τῶν ἀρετῶν ἡγεμὼν, *the captain of all virtues*, πρὸς τὸν 6. Ἀπομνημον. βιβλ. δ.

θείαν ἀπάντων ἀναφορὰν ἔχοντα, *as having respect to the divine cause*, he addes that the *precept* concerning that in the *golden verses*, had justly the *precedence* and *deference* before all *lawes*, to give the *Gods* that *honor which is due unto them, and all things else according to that order* * ὣ ὁ δημιουργικὸς νόμος ἅμα τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῶν συμπεφύκασι, *which the creative law* (that sure is the *Christians law* of *Nature*) *together with their being, had afforded them.* But perhaps such evidences as these are the *Philosophy* against which the *Reader* was to be forewarned in the *title page*, and therefore,

* Εἰς Χρυσ. p. 10.

7. *Secondly*, I must adde, to demonstrate the *uselesness* of his *distinction* in this place, that it is as possible to *exceed* in *trust*, in *feare*, nay even in *love*, as it is in *prayer*; Thus he that so *trusts* in *God*, as not to *fear*; he that *trusts* him with the *end*, so as to neglect the *means*, parallel to him that *prays* and neglects his *calling*; he that *trusts* and *relies* and *hopes*, but doth not *purifie*, (performs not the *Evangelical* condition) every one of these is, in proportion with M. C. his instances of *prayer* and *fasting*, an *exceeder* in *trust*, we are wont to express it by *presuming*.

8. 2. He that so *fears*, as not to *love*, that *fears where no fear is*, *that walkes accurately* ὡς ἄσοφος *as a fool*, he will be as properly an *exceeder* in *fear*.

3. He that so *loves God* again, either as not to *fear God*, or as not to *love* his *brother* also; he that hath a *zeal* to *God*, but not according to *knowledge*, he is in like manner an *exceeder* in *love*. And yet all this while none of these are *religious too much*, but *too little*, though they exceed the *bounds* of one part of *duty*, they are *defective* in another, and tis this *defect*, not that other *exceeding*, that is *criminous*, *These things ought they to have done, but not to leave the other undone*; and these *omissions* are their *crimes*, and as truly so in the *natural* as in the *instituted* worship, though if the *instituted worship* in any branch be preferred before any branch of *natural* duty, or be more *intensely* and *frequently* practised, to the *neglecting* thereof, this may be a greater *fault* then if one part of *natural worship* be intended to the *detriment* of another either *superior* or *equal* to it, as if *Sacrifice* (which I acknowledge an *instituted worship*) be intended or prest to the *omission* of *necessary charities*, *ceremonies* to the slacking of the *inward fervor*, or the like.

So

So that ſtill all that this *Diatribiſt's ſubdivided diſtinctions* have done for us (beſide diſcovering his own *miſtakes*) is onely this, to propoſe *one* ſort of things, wherein in his *opinion*, a man may be *too religious*, viz. in *giving God more then he requires by the rule of worſhip*, or, as again he expreſſeth it, by the *leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip*, which, ſaith he, *is too much*, and *ſuch a man may be too religious*. And this being the onely product of his *diſtinction*, is, as I intimated, ſo far from *clearing*, that it is the *perplexing* and *intricating* the buſineſs, which was formerly clear enough, the leading the *Reader* not *out* but *into Meanders*, an *intanglement* of the *clue*, a *Sphinx* inſtead of an *Oedipus*.

10. For there was no ſuch ἀμφίβολον before, nothing ſo *difficult*, ſo *involved*, of ſo *incertain* and *dubious* ſignification, as this which now he calls [*giving God more then he requires by the rule of worſhip*] and explains by [*uncommanded worſhip*, and, *the leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip*.]

11. I ſhall evince the truth of what I now ſay, and with the ſame hand *clear* again what he hath *clouded*, by asking him but this one *queſtion*, Doth he mean in theſe words [*more*] and [*Addition*] any new *ſpecies* or ſort of *worſhip*, neither *preſcribed* by the *law* of *Nature*, nor *inſtituted* by any *poſitive law* of *God*? or doth he deſigne onely ſome *circumſtance* onely, or *ceremony*, which being not of the *intrinſick nature* or *eſſence* of *worſhip*, but onely *accidental* to it, is not particularly *commanded* or *preſcribed* by the *word* of *God*, the *rule* of *worſhip*? ſuch are the *time*, the *place*, the *geſtures*, and ſuch *outward*, but ſome of them *inſeparable attendants of worſhip*.

12. I ſhall deſire to ſecure my expreſſions from *obſcurity* and *miſtakes*, and therefore to be as explicit as may be; *Prayer* is a *ſpecies* of *worſhip*; *praying* on the *Lords day*, on *Chriſtmas day*, obſerving conſtant *hours* of *prayer*, *thrice*, *ſeven*, *ten* times every day, is each of them a *circumſtance* adherent to *Prayer*; ſome *time* is *neceſſary* and *inſeparable* from *Prayer*, but every of theſe times forementioned are not ſo, he that *prayes* but *thrice* doth not *pray ſeven* or *ten* times a day, So again the *place* of *prayer* may give it a *different* denomination, either of *publick* or *private*; the manner may render it more or leſs *ſolemn*, the *geſtures* more or leſs *reverent* or *irreverent*, the *increaſe*, letting down of *ardor*,

devout or *formal*, and there are many *ſorts*, and *degrees* of each of theſe, but theſe do not conſtitute *new* or ſeveral *ſorts* of *worſhip*, but all are *accidents* of one and the ſame *ſpecial* of *worſhip*, viz. of *Prayer*.

13. Here then is a wide difference, and if his meaning were of the *ſpecies* or ſorts of *worſhip*, then I never doubted to affirm with him, that all *uncommanded worſhip* is an *exceſs*, if he pleaſe, (an *error*, I ſhould rather ſay) a ſetting up that for *worſhip* of *God*, which is not *worſhip*, nay perhaps quite *contrary* to *worſhip*; and this ſure was never *juſtified* by me *explicitely*, or *implicitely*, in *concluſions*, or in grounds and *principles* of thus concluding, and ſo ſtill this hath not been uſefull to me to diſcover any *miſtake* of mine.

14. The ſecond then is the onely branch remaining, of which his words, as referring to me, can poſſibly be underſtood, and then 'twil prove ſo far from being any *miſadventure* of mine, that it will devolve all abſurdity upon the *Diatribiſt*.

15. For I ſhall demand, Hath the *rule* of *worſhip*, *i. e.* the *Scripture*, any where preſcribed the *times*, the *places*, the *geſtures*, and all the *circumſtances* of the *worſhip* of *God*, and that both *poſitively* and *excluſively*, ſo that he that *prayes* oftener then the *Scripture* expreſly *commands*, or on any day not aſſigned to that purpoſe by *Scripture*, *ſinnes* in ſo doing, *addes* to the *rule*, *gives more then God requires*, doth *too much*, is *too religious*, is *criminous* and *abominable* to *God* in ſo doing? every of theſe muſt be the *affirmations* of this *Diatribiſt*, if this 2d. meaning be his, and the like he is obliged to ſay again of him that *prays* in any *place*, in any *manner*, in any *geſture*, which the word of *Scripture*, the *rule* of *worſhip* hath not commanded.

16. And becauſe this is by all reaſon to be reſolved to be his meaning, or elſe his whole *Book* is perfectly caſt away, a meer *πυγμαχία* or *beating the air*, without me or any man elſe to be his *adverſarie*, I ſhall at the preſent ſuppoſe it ſo, and ſhew him, as *deictically* as he can wiſh, the *abſurdities* of it.

17. And 1. for the *times* of *prayer*, I demand, What hath the *rule* of *worſhip*, the *Scripture* preſcribed? hath it preſcribed *morning* and *evening Prayer*, and that both *poſitively*, and *excluſively* to any more? If ſo, then by the *ſtandard* of this *Diatribiſt's* doctrine, *Davids* or *Daniels praying three times a day*, adding the

the noon day ſeaſon to the other *two*, muſt be *criminous* and *abominable*: or if he ſhall pitch upon any other *number* of times, as *preſcribed* by the *Rule*, then I ſhall add an *unite* more to that *number* and demand, whether that *addition* will adde *abomination* to his *performances*? If he ſaith it will, though I might preſs that *affirmation* with *abſurdities* enough, yet I ſhall ſpare it, and onely demand the *proof* from the *Scripture* for this *aſſertion*, and when he gives it me forfeit all my *pretenſions* to the *underſtanding* that *ſacred book*; but if he cannot produce any ſuch *Scripture*, then is my *Cenſor* the *guilty* perſon, the very *dogmatizer*, that *teacheth for Doctrines* or *Commandments* of *God*, his own *Dictates*, which I muſt ſuppoſe to be the *traditions* of a *man*, and the doing ſo, I cannot reſiſt to be a *nimiety*, but not of *religion*, that I yet diſcern.

In like manner for *ſet days* to be *conſecrated* to the *worſhip* of *God*, for *faſting* or for *prayer*, I demand how many every *week* or every *yeer* hath the *Rule* of *worſhip preſcribed*? Or what *rule* of *worſhip* ſhall be appealed to? the *Law* of *Moſes*, or the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*? His *anſwer* to this queſtion will involve him in *intricacies* enough: If the *Law* of *Moſes* be the *rule*, then he knows all the *New Moons* and *feaſts* of the *Jews*, and *Sabbatick years* and *Jubilees* muſt return upon him: If the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, which hath certainly *aboliſht* all theſe, and, as he ſuppoſeth, ſet up the *Lords-day*, inſtead of them all, then 1. I demand in what words of the *New Teſtament* the *weekly* obſervation of this is *commanded*? and 2. in what words the *obſerving* all others but that, particularly the *Feaſt* of *Eaſter*, the *annual* commemorative of the *Reſurrection*, is interdicted, and whether the *weekly* remembrance of ſo great a *mercy*, being ſo *acceptable* to *God*, it be reaſonable to think the *annual*, *abominable* before him? And the ſame *queſtion* ſoon extends it ſelf to the day of *Chriſts Incarnation*, *Paſſion*, *Aſcenſion*, &c. and if of each of theſe he ſhall define and pronounce them *unlawfull*, without *teſtimony* and *verdict* from the *Rule* of *worſhip*, the *Scripture*, then he is the *Dogmatizer*, that hath added to the *Rule*, more *interdicts* then are there to be met with, and ſo ſtill he is the man *guilty* of the *nimiety*. 18.

So again for *geſtures* in the *worſhip* of *God*, I demand, What 19.

is the *gesture* of *prayer*, prescribed by the *Rule*? Is it *standing*, *sitting*, or *kneeling*, any, or all of these, or any fourth superadded to these? If the *Rule* have prescribed none, then according to his *doctrine* again, any of these must be *criminous additions* to the *Rule*, *abominable*, &c. If the *rule* have prescribed some *one*, then all others, beside that one, must fall under the same *severity*, that that *one*, had done, if it had not been *prescribed*: and if all three are under several *precepts*, and so the whole *Rule* obeyed by retaining these *three*, then still I shall mention a *fourth*, that of *prostration*, whether will the old *penitents*, in the *porch*, or on the *pavement*, every man in his *closet* and *recesse*, and still the *question* returns, whether this be *criminous*, and by what part of the *rule* of *worship* it appears to be so?

20. *Necdum finitus* the *enumeration* of the *Diatribists* inextricable difficulties is not yet at an *end*, but infinitely *multipliable* by every act of *Religious Fast*, and of *Almsgiving*, the *two* other sorts of *Gods worship* (as *Aquinas* (owned here by the *Diatribist*) hath defined from the *sixt* of *Matthew*) the *proportions* or *degrees* of each of which are yet no where defined in the *Scripture*. But I suppose it cannot now be *necessary*, that I farther *confirm* what is so *evident* already.

21. Else I might yet farther proceed from the *duties* of the *first* to the *second Table*, and demand whether any thing that is done (out of the *service* of *God*) for which there is no *command*, be a *criminous excess*? Certainly the *Analogy* will hold, *God* having given the *Rule* for *justice* and *charity*, as well as *worship*, and then whatsoever of any kind is not under *precept*, must by this *argument* be under *interdict*, and so there will be nothing left *indifferent* in the world: A *conclusion* that some men which have held Mr. *C.* his *hypothesis* have rationally *inlarged* to, finding it *necessary*, and *unavoidably* deduced from thence: But I discern not yet, that Mr. *C.* hath thus improved his *principle*, though sure whensoever it is for his *turn*, it is thus *improvable*.

22. But Mr. *C.* hath added three proofs to his *affirmation*, and how *unreconcileable* soever with *common notions* that is, yet those must deserve to be *heeded*; And his first proof is this, *If a man or Church may adde to the Rules of Religion, then he or they may be two Religions: But* Ergo.

Here

Here it muſt be remembred, that the thing which he had propoſed to himſelf to *prove*, was this, that *in uncommanded worſhip the leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious: And this*, ſaith he, *I prove*, 1. *If a man or Church may adde to the rule of religion, &c.* Of this 1. I deſire to be told, whether it be not a meer *idem per idem*, a proving a thing by *it ſelf*, and whether that be not contrary to all *rules* of *ſyllogizing*, where the *medium* of *probation* is never to enter the *concluſion*, as here moſt evidently it doth. 23.

Having ſaid this to the *form*, tis not needfull that I ſay any thing to the *matter* of this *proof*, it being the very thing that I have ſpoken to all this while, and by that *diſtinction*, of the *ſorts* and *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, I have competently ſhewed, that it hath no force againſt me; that indeed he that introduces any *new part* of *divine worſhip*, is a *preſumptuous aſſumer*, doth *more* then he ſhould, becauſe that which he ſhould *not* do, and ſo that the *Major* is *falſe*, inſtead of *clear*; he that thus *addes*, and impoſeth on *God* and his *word*, is not hereby *too religious*, but too *bold*, and was never pleaded for in the leaſt, by my *treatiſe* of *Superſtition*. 24.

The *inconſequence* of this *Major* will more appear, by conſiderig the *proof* of the *Aſſumption*, which he annexes, *The aſſumption*, ſaith he, *is proved by Deut.* 4. 2. *where all additions to the word are prohibited.* 25.

But I pray doth he that *proſtrates* himſelf in *prayer*, *adde* to the *word* of *God*? then ſure he that *walks* in the *garden*, doth ſo too, much more he that makes any ſuch *deductions* from *Scripture*, as this *Diatribiſt* here doth. (for not onely the *analogie* enforceth this, but it is alſo to be remembred, that the *laws* which had here been given by *Moſes*, were *all* ſorts of *duties* of common life, towards *our ſelves*, and our *brethren*, as well as of *worſhip* toward *God*, and ſo this Text muſt exclude all other *uncommanded* actions, as well as *worſhips*) The words in *Deuteronomy* are theſe, *Ye ſhall not adde to the word that I command you, neither ſhall ye diminiſh from it*, לשמר *ad cuſtodiendum*, and in the ſame ſenſe the *Targum* לְמִטַר *to obſerve*, or *that ye may obſerve that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.* The meaning is moſt evident that they were to perform *uniform* 26.

obedience

obedience to *God*, not to make any *change* in *Gods commands*, either to pretend more *liberties*, or *fewer obligations*, or again more *obligations* and fewer *liberties*, to be delivered them by *God*, then those which he had then delivered by *Moses*, but to set themselves humbly to the *performance* of his *precepts*, and accordingly the *Septuagint* renders תשמר to *keep*] φυλάξασθε *ye shall keep*, the *Latine*, *custodite keep*, and the *Syriack*, *sed observate*, *but keep the commandments*, by that *opposition* shewing that to be the meaning of *not adding* or *diminishing*, *viz. paying* an *obedience* to *Gods* commands. And the same sense in the like words we have again *Apoc.* 22. 18, 19. to shut up the *great prophecy* in the *New Testament*; And then, I pray, is he that offends against either of these *two* texts, *too Religious*? Is it not more true on the contrary, that he is a *false Prophet*, and a *sacrilegious* person, that pretends the *word* of the *Lord* for that which *God* hath not spoken to him? But this *crime* I hope every man is not guilty of, that *bowes* or *kneeles* or *prostrates* himself in *prayer*, by such *outward gestures* both *signifying*, and *inflaming* the *inward fervor* of the *heart*, but not inserting any *precept* of doing thus, either into the book of *Deuteronomy*, or the *Apocalyps*. And this may suffice for his *first proof*.

27. His second proof is from the *saying of the great School man*, *that Religion is a moral virtue* (*or very like it*) *and stands between two extremes*, *Ergo*, *a man may be too much religious*, *as well as too little*.

28. *First*, I answer to the *antecedent*, that if it be remembred what the two *extremes* are, between which *religion*, in *Aquinas*, stands, the consequent will never be inferred from it. The *extremes* are on one side *Superstition*, on the other *irreligion*, *superstition* is again, saith he, of *two* sorts, either 1. the *worshiping* of a *creature* (of *false Gods*, or more *Gods* then *one*, as in *Tertullian adv. Marc.* l. 1. c. 5. speaking of the *worshiping* of *two Gods*, *Verorer*, saith he, *ne abundantia officii superstitio potius quàm religio crederetur*, *I should fear such abundance of officiousness would be rather believed superstition then religion*; and S. *Augustine*, and out of him * *Aquinas*, *tangis primam chordam quacolitur unus Deus*, *& cecidit bestia superstitionis*, *the beast of superstition is destroyed by the first string of the Decachord*, *the first commandment of the Decalogue*,

* 2ª 2ª. qu. 92. art. 1.

calogue, preſcribing the worſhip of one God.) or 2. *cum Deo illegitimus cultus tribuitur, giving undue worſhip to God*, and neither of theſe notions of *ſuperſtition* will be at all uſefull to the *Diatribiſt* to prove his *concluſion*.

29. If from the *former* of theſe he ſhould conclude that a man may be *too religious*, tis plain that this muſt be his meaning, that a man may be a *Polytheiſt*, a *worſhipper* of *falſe Gods*, but I hope, in this ſenſe, he that obſerves the *ceremonies* of the *Church* of *England*, he that *commemorates* the *birth* of *Chriſt* on the 25 of *Deber*, will not be ſaid to be *too religious*.

30. As for the 2. that of *cultus illegitimus*, or *indebitus*, *undue worſhip* of the *true God* (which alone can poſſibly be deemed for the *Diatribiſt's* purpoſe) my anſwer ſhall be more *particular*, by viewing & weighing the words in *Aquinas* which are here referred to: though the place be not ſet down by the *Diatribiſt*, I ſuppoſe it muſt be 2da 2^dæ either *queſt.* 81. *Art.* 1. or elſe *qu.* 92. *Art.* 1. in *concluſ.* which indeed hath theſe words, *Religio eſt virtus moralis, omnis autem virtus moralis in medio conſiſtit, Religion is a moral virtue, and every moral virtue conſiſts in the middle*, citing it (with a *ſicut ſupra dictum eſt*) from the former place *qu.* 81 *Art.* 5. Now the ſumme of that *Article* is this, that * *Religion* is neither a *Theological* nor an *Intellectual*, but a *moral virtue*, as being a branch of *juſtice*, in giving to *God* that which belongs to him, and that the *due medium*, wherein this, as all *moral virtue* conſiſts, is to be taken, not as the *middle* point between two *paſſions*, the * *medium rei* (as ordinarily *moral virtue* is the moderating of *paſſions*, reducing them to a *mediocrity*, or *temper*, or *equilibration* betwixt the *exceſs* and *defect*) but according to ſome *equality*, in reſpect of *God*, * *medium rationis*, interpreting what he means by that, *viz. equality*, not *abſolutely*, becauſe we cannot *give God ſo much as belongs to him*, but *ſecundum quandam conſiderationem humanæ facultatis & divinæ acceptationis* (by *conſidering what man is able to do, and what God will accept*; As for *ſuperfluity* in ſuch things as theſe, which belong to the *worſhip* of *God*, there can be none, ſaith he, *ſecundam circumſtantiam quanti*, as to the *circumſtance of quantity*, I cannot do *too much* in the *worſhip* of *God*, I cannot offend that way but, as * elſewhere he ſaith of this, and the like, *tanto eſt melius, quanto*

* Reſp. ad. 3.

* Vid 1.2.q.64. Art. 2.

* Ibid.

* 1.2.q.64. Art. 4. in corp.

quanto magis acceditur ad ſummum, it is ſo much the better, by how much it comes neerer the higheſt. All the *ſuperfluity* poſſible is as to the other *circumſtances*, and he names but three, 1. *cui non debet*, by exhibiting *divine worſhip* to him *to whom* it *ought* not to be exhibited, 2. *quando non debet*, by giving it *at a time when it ought not*, (when having formerly been *acceptable* to *God*, tis now *outdated*) 3. in reſpect of other *circumſtances*, *prout non debet*, in a *manner wherein it ought not.*

31. By this it appears already, how *incompetent* this *teſtimony* from *Aquinas* is, to prove the *concluſion* propoſed by the *Diatribiſt*, that every thing in the *worſhip* of *God* which is *not commanded* by *God*, is *too much.* For ſure every thing that is *not commanded*, is not preſently *forbidden*, nor conſequently *offends* againſt the *prout debet, as it ought*, the *due manner*, *time*, or other *circumſtances* of it. If there be any difficulty in that phraſe [*prout debet, as it ought*] and it be conceived to ſignifie ſo as is *particularly commanded* by *God*, and *è contra*, that what ever is done, being not particularly *commanded* by *God*, is *prout non debet, as it ought not*, this is certainly a *miſtake*, and very diſtant from *Aquinas*'s ſenſe, who means by *cultus debitus*, *due worſhip*, any *acts* of *worſhip*, * *qui ad Dei reverentiam fiunt, which are done to the honour of God*, with conſidering whether they be under *precept* or not, and conſequently with him *cultus indebitus*, *undue worſhip*, is ſuch as is done to the *diſhonor*, at leaſt not to the *honor* of *God*, as when of *Idolatry* he ſaith, that it * *exhibits divine reverence, indebitè, unduly to the creature.*

* 2ª 2æ q. 81. Art. 5. in corp.

* Q. 92. art. 2. corp.

32. In full accord with this it is, that in that *other* text *qu.* 92. *art.* 1. *Superſtition* is by him defined to be a *vice oppoſed to religion in the exceſſe, whereby a man gives worſhip to him to whom he ought not, or not in a manner that he ought*, meaning as he explains himſelf, not that of quantity, but in reſpect of other *circumſtances*, when either it is faſtned on a *wrong object*, *divine worſhip* to that which is not *God*, (which ſure is *againſt*, not onely *without* the *command* of *God*) or done in a *wrong manner*, *i. e.* when any thing is done in the *divine worſhip*, * *quod fieri non debet, which ought not to be done*, and he * inſtances, *ſi quis temporibus gratia vellet colere Deum ſecundum veteris legis ritum, if any man under Chriſtianity would worſhip God after the rites of the old law*, which ſure

* In reſp. ad tertium.

* Art. 2. in reſp. ad tertium.

ſure are not onely *not commanded* but *forbidden* under *Chriſt*, and ſo are a *proper* inſtance of the *quando non debet* the *undue circumſtance* of *time*, mentioned *particularly* in the former place, and *convinces* that which I aſſigned to be the *meaning* of it. I need adde no more in this place concerning the *teſtimony* of *Aquinas*. Other mentions of his opinion in this matter, will hereafter occur, and then I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeake more to them.

33. His 3. *proof* is from the Doctors *own conceſſion*, *who*, ſaith he, *grants there may be a nimiety or exceſs of religion*, and addes words in ſuch a *ſtyle* as are abſolutely *nonſenſe*, even when the [*not*] (which I ſuppoſe the *inſertion* of the *Printer*) is blotted out, thus *there may be a nimiety in adding, and ſo is an exceeder in the fear and ſervice of God.*

34. But to paſs by that, I *anſwer*, 1. that the Dr. no where uſeth that *phraſe*, a *nimiety* or *exceſs* of *religion*, the words [*of religion*] are inſerted by the *citer* and honeſtly put in *different* letters, to note them to be his own.

35. The matter is plain, I there ſpeak of an *exceſs* of *fear*, but not of *religion* (ſee the beginning of §. 46. of the *Tr.* of *ſuperſtit.*) and though I after ſay, that *he that thinks himſelf bound or obliges others, as from God, when God neither commands nor forbids, and ſo addes to the commands of God, and fears where there is no reaſon to fear, is an exceeder in the fear and ſervice of God*, yet neither is that *exceſs of religion*, nor indeed *exceſs of fear* or *of ſervice of God*, but the meaning is apparently this, that in *fearing God*, and *ſerving God* he is guilty of ſome other *exceſs*, not an *exceſs* of *fear* of *God*, but *fearing* ſomewhat elſe, which he phanſies to come from *God*, when it doth not, this fear of that *ſomething* elſe, is an *exceſsive fear* more then *religion* ſuggeſts to him, and yet the unhappineſs of it is, this interpoſeth it ſelf in *religion*.

This will be more evident by an *example*, ſuppoſe a man to phanſie that by *Gods law* he ought to *kill* his *Father*, and *fears Gods wrath* if he doth not, this mans *fear* is *exceſſive*, but his *religion* is not, he is an *exceeder in the ſervice of God*, if he do that in *Gods ſervice*, which is no part of it, but quite *contrary* to it, but doth not mean-while *ſerve God too much*, but *too little*, doth not *exceed* but fall *ſhort*, and ſo is farre from being *too religious*.

There was certainly great need of *Arguments*, when this was thought fit to be produced to me, who ſure knew my own *meaning* when I thus ſpake, and was likely enough to be able to give this *account* of it. As it is, I have done with his firſt *diſcovery* of *cauſes* of my *miſcarriages*, and ſhall now haſten to the *ſecond*.

Sect. 4.

Exceſs of Religion. Super ſtatutum. Addition to the Rule. Doctrines. Δεισιδαιμονία, Act. 17.22. Act. 25.19. *Six conceſſions.* Superſtitioſus. *Worſhipping of Angels.* Superſtitum cultus. *Slavish fear. Religion in* Epicurus. *Fear of punishment in ſons; in wicked men. The neceſſity thereof. Dogmatizing. Placing more virtue in things then belongs to them.*

Numb. 1. THe *ſecond cauſe of the Doctors miſcarriages*, ſaith he, *is his miſpriſion, That exceſs in Religion is not well called Superſtition, or that Superſtition is not exceſs of Religion.* Sect. 27 &c.

2. To this I anſwer, 1. That my *memorie* not ſuggeſting unto me, that I was at all guilty of this *miſpriſion*, thus unlimitedly charged on me, I therefore read over that 27. and the two following Sections, to diſcern what it was that had given him *occaſion* to affirm this, and there I find no ſuch thing. The ſubject of Section 27. being the improperneſs of their *expreſſions*, who reſolve *Superſtition*, *ſimply* and *abſtractly* taken, in all *Authors*, to ſignifie *evil*; of Sect. 28. a ſecond *inconſequence*, that the uſe of *Ceremonies* not preſcribed by *Chriſt*, ſhould firſt be called *Superſtition*, then condemned for deſerving that *title*; of the 29. a third *inconſequent*, that men ſhould *abſtain* from ſome *indifferent Ceremonies*, as *Superſtitious*, and not expect to be counted *ſuperſtitious* for *obliging* themſelves to do the *contrary*. But ſure none of theſe, nor all together, do at all yield any ground for that *concluſion*, which he hath here *miſreported* from them, and that one would think, were a *competent* anſwer to this ſecond *diſcovery of cauſes*.

3. But then 2. till the ἀμφίβολον be explained, and agreed on, what

is

is meant by *exceſs* of *religion*, tis not poſſible for me to *affirm* or *deny*, to *acknowledge* or *diſclaim univerſally*, what I am ſaid to *affirm*. To deal plainly then, and without all *ambiguity*, If by *exceſs* of *Religion* he underſtand the doing of any thing in the *worſhip* of *God*, which *Gods word* doth *not command* (which is the onely thing which is of *controverſie* betwixt us, as hath already been manifeſted) then I ſtick not to deny that this is *Superſtition*, or that *ſuperſtition* in any *authentick* notion, or in the *origination* of the word whether *Greek* or *Latine*, doth import or comporhend this, and if he ſhall flie to any other ſort of *exceſs*, and contend that to be it of which he ſpeaks, this will be then the *fallacie* or lying hid in *ambiguities*, which I took care to deprive him of in the laſt *Section*.

4. 4. But he expreſſes ſufficiently what *exceſs* in *religion* he means, by the proof which he firſt offers to *confirm* his *affirmative*. For, for this he brings three proofs, and the firſt is this, becauſe it is an *addition* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, and ſo an *exceſs*, as *ſuper ſtatutum*.

5. 5. Here though it be very hard to reduce this to any *formal* or *legal* proof of the *propoſition* for which it was deſigned (and beſides, it muſt be obſerved, in paſſing, that the *medium* here uſed, is no fitter for the proving of this then of the *laſt propoſition*; for it is the *ſame* to *both*, and ſo indeed it is *equally* proper for *both*, or for what elſe he pleaſe) yet thus much is clear from it, that by *exceſs* in *Religion* he means *addition* to the *Rule*, and that we formerly diſcern'd to ſignifie with him the doing any thing *uncommanded* in the *ſervice of God*, and to that we have replyed abundantly in the laſt *Section*.

6. But he adds for the *confirmation* of his proof, one thing not ſaid before, that all ſuch *addition* to the *Rule* muſt be *ſuperſtition* forſooth, becauſe it is *ſuper ſtatutum*, *above what is commanded*, ſuppoſing, it ſeems, that that is the *notation* of the word *ſuperſtition*. And then I deſire the *Diatribiſt's* leave, that it may for once be my turn to make *diſcoveries* of *cauſes*, to propoſe to him, at leaſt for *conſideration*, whether this may not be his αἴτιον ψευδος *fundamental procreative miſtake*, the having inconſiderately in his youth ſwallowed this *etymologie* of the word *ſuperſtition* (I am unwilling to phanſie the *Diatribiſt* to be the *inventer* of it) as

if it were ſo called from *ſupra ſtatutum*, *above what is commanded.*

7. If this be not a right *conjecture*, I ſhall profeſs to be at an end of my *ſearch* of *cauſes*; But if it be, I deſire him to allow me the favour once to *diſabuſe* him, by *exacting* this *juſtice* from him to himſelf, to conſider whether any *Laws* of *derivation*, *compoſition* or *analogie* can permit him ſeriouſly to believe that [*ſtatutum*] is ingredient in compounding *Superſtition*, or that it can be by any Rules deduced from any word in the *Latine* tongue, but *ſuperſtes*, *ſuperſtitis*, and the rather becauſe δεισιδαιμονία, which is reſolved to be the *parallel Greek* to the *Latine ſuperſtition*, and is viſibly ſo, if it be allowed to be deduced from *ſuperſtitum cultus*, hath nothing to do with *ſuper ſtatutum*, but is in plain words a *worſhipping* of *Demons*.

8. Of this ſure I have ſaid enough in the *Treatiſe* of *Superſtition*, to ſatisfie any Scholar, that knows in the leaſt, what belongs to the uſe or the *nature* of words, and ſo much, it ſeems, that Mr. *C.* confeſſes that the *original* of the word was *Heatheniſh*, to ſignifie *ſuperſtitum cultus*, and only adds (δικαίων ὑπόθεσιν, in civility or *fidelity* to his cauſe) that *though this be true, yet 'tis well applied by Divines to thoſe additions made to the Rule of worſhip.* But I pray what is this but to grant the *premiſes*, and deny the *concluſion*? Tis certain and by him acknowledged, that the *original* of the word is another thing, not *ſuper ſtatutum*, what then can he tolerably mean by [*tis well applied by Divines*]? can *Divines* do *well* to *apply* *ſuperſtitio* to *ſuper ſtatutum*, when that is no way the nature of the word? Or can any proof be brought from hence to conclude *ſuperſtition* an *exceſs*, or *addition* to the *rule*, becauſe it is *ſuper ſtatutum*, when there is no affinity between *ſuper ſtatutum* and *ſuperſtition*? what is or can be *unreaſonable*, if this be not?

9. And ſo it appears how little truth there is in that which ſhuts up this firſt reaſon [*That which the Old Teſtament calls addition to the word, the New calls doctrines, traditions of men, will-worſhip, ſuperſtition.*] In which few words as there be many *infirm* parts, 1. That *additions to the word* are in the *N. T.* called *Doctrines* I ſuppoſe he means *teaching* ſomewhat elſe *for doctrines*, Mat. 15 9. *aſſuming* them to be ſuch when they are not:

So

So again, *Mar.*7.7. where yet the word *Doctrines* ſignifies the *Scripture* or *Doctrine* of *God*, and ſo the *teaching* their own *traditions for doctrines*, is adding them to the *Scripture*, *Doctrines* there ſimply ſignifying not that *addition*, but that to which the *addition* is made) and 2. that they are called *wil-worſhip* (the contrary of which is proved in the *Treatiſe* of *wil-worſhip*, and here to ſuppoſe it, is a *begging* of the *queſtion*) ſo ſure this is a third, that *additions* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, are any where in the *New T.* called *ſuperſtition*, I deſire he will ſhew me one ſuch place, for my *Concordance* will not afford it me.

10. Tis but a δὶς λεγόμενον, only *twice* there uſed: Firſt, *Act.* 17.22. by St. *Paul* of the *Athenians*, whom he *perceived* to be δεισιδαιμονεστέρους *more ſuperſtitious* then others: But theſe ſure never medled with, and ſo *added* not to the *true rule* of *worſhip*, any otherwiſe then as all that *abandon* it, *adde* to it, live by ſome other *falſe rule*, and minde not that; and if they are, for ſo doing, to be ſtyled *adders* to the *rule* of *Worſhip*, *adulterers* are ſo in like manner, and ſo by that meaſure or *ſtandard*, every *ſin* in the world is *ſuperſtition*.

11. Secondly, the word is uſed, *Act.*25.29. where *Feſtus* ſpeaks of *Pauls* ἰδία δεισιδαιμονία, *own ſuperſtition*, but ſure meant not to accuſe him of *adding* to his or the *Jews rule* of *worſhip*, but underſtood his *own Religion*, and nothing elſe by that *phraſe*. And ſo ſtill μηδὲν ὑγιὲς, here are as many *miſadventures* amaſſt together, as could well be crowded into ſo few words.

12. His ſecond proof now follows, thus, Becauſe as the *defect* in *Religion* is called *profaneneſs*, ſo the *exceſs* is called *ſuperſtition*, as ſtanding in *oppoſition* to it. Alas, it ſeems there is great need of proofs, for this again, as the former, was the very *medium* to prove the firſt *propoſition*, and ſo either the firſt, and this ſecond *propoſition* of his are all one (and then why was it cut in two, by *Lucians beetle?*) or elſe theſe proofs are very *excellent* inſtruments, fitted for all turns *indifferently*. However it is, I ſhall not need provide *new* anſwers to it, but remand it to the former *Section*, where it was conſidered to the utmoſt it could pretend: Only if he pleaſe, I ſhall put it in *form* for him, thus. The *worſhip* of the many *falſe Gods* or *Demons* is an *exceſs* oppoſed to *Religion*, or *worſhip* of the *one true God* of *heaven* and *earth*, in

Aquinas's

Aquinas's opinion, and ſo alſo is the *worſhipping* the *true God* after an *undue* or *unlawfull* manner, *ergo*, the uſing any *Ceremony* (in the *worſhip* of the *true God*) which the *Scripture* hath *not commanded*, is *ſuperſtition*, and *ſuperſtition* is that: As if he ſhould ſay, *ſuperſtition* is that, becauſe it is ſomewhat elſe, as extremely diſtant from that, as that which is not *God* is from *God*, or as *unlawfull* (for ſo is *ſuperſtition*) is from *lawfull*, for ſuch is that which is not *prohibited*.

13. 13. A *third* proof he now adds of his *affirmation*, and that after the manner obſerved in his former *argument* from the *Doctors* own *conceſſions*, and no leſs then *five*, nay the fourth number being *twice* repeated, no leſs then *ſix* of them: And if I have ſo liberally granted it, I wonder how it came to be my charge, and that as the *cauſe* of my *miſcarriages*, that I *denyed* it.

14. But 'tis ſtrange to ſee what ἁμαρτίαι ἀνθολκῆς can do, *phanſie* firſt, and next *accuſe* me of *denying* a thing *groſſo modo*, and to prove me to have *erred* in thus *denying*, produce *ſix* ſeveral *ſenſes*, wherein I have granted it, whereas there is in the whole *inditement* but one pretended, wherein I had *denyed* it. In all reaſon thoſe *ſix conceſſions* might have reconciled the *Diatribiſt* to me, and perſwaded him that I was of his minde, rather then one ſingle appearance of *diſſenting* have thus *provoked* him.

15. The *Doctors Conceſſions*, ſuch as they are, are evidently reconcileable with all that he hath *propoſed*, in that *Tract* of *Superſtition*, and the deſcending to a *particular* view of them, as they are marſhalled up by the *Diatribiſt*, will take away all doubt in this matter.

16. *Firſt*, ſaith he, *he grants that ſuperſtitions may denote ſuch an exceſs*, Sect. 31. Here I demand what Mr. *C.* means by *ſuch an exceſs*? that indeed is thus far anſwered already, that he means an *exceſs* of *Religion*: But what *exceſs* in *Religion*? The *ſuper ſtatutum*, every *addition* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, *i.e.* every *uncommanded circumſtance*, or *Ceremony* in the *worſhip* of *God*? Thus he muſt mean, if he be *conſtant* to himſelf, and if the *Doctors Conceſſions* yield him any appearance of proof for his *affirmative*. But to ſee the luck of it, this firſt *citation* from the *Doctor* is ſo far from yielding him any ſuch *teſtimony*, that it is indeed

indeed the quite *contrary*; for that which the *Doctor* there observes *Sect.* 31. is this, that the word *superstitiosus* may indeed denote such *excess* from the force of the *termination osus*, but this no more then the word *religiosus* also denotes, in the opinion of *Agellius* out of *Nigidius Figulus*, and consequently, that 1. *Superstitio* and *Religio* were all one in that same *Author*'s opinion: and 2. that it is the animadversion of *Agellius* upon that *Author*, that all such *excesses* are not culpable, or taken in *ill*, but *good* senses. And then was not this a dangerous *concession*, fit to be called out in judgement against me, then which nothing could be more direct to the *asserting* mine, and refuting the *Diatribists hypothesis*?

17. If this account of the word *superstitiosus* were not sufficient, to secure my pretensions, which in that place were only this, that *superstition* among all *Authors* signified not any *criminous excess*. I might farther adde, that even when the word *superstitiosus*; is but a bare *denominative* from *superstitio*, and yet is used in an *ill* sense, as when we *Christians* say a *superstitious* person, the account is clear, that *superstition* there signifies *Heathen-worship*, or somewhat proportionable to it * *worshipping* of others beside the one true *God*; and by analogie with that notion of the *substantive*, the *adjective* fitly denotes him that acts like one of those *false worshippers*, or agrees with them in some eminent thing, which is a branch of their *false worship*, as he that makes *observations* of *dreams*, and *ominous days*, or *occurrences*, is said commonly to be *superstitious* herein, *i.e.* to imitate the *Auguries* of the *Heathen*, and many the like.

* *Superstitiosum est quicquid ab hominibus institutum est ad facienda & colenda idola pertinens.* August: *de doctr. Christ:* l. 2. c. 20.

18. The 2. *concession*, that the *worship of Angels is an excess or addition to the object of worship, and by him styled that crime of superstition*] a man would wonder to see produced by the *Diatribist* against me. Tis certain I make the *worship* of *Angels superstition*, *worshipping* those *fellow creatures*, which a *Christian* ought not to *worship*; But is this an *excess* of *religion*, or not rather of *impiety*? *worshipping* of the *creature* παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα *besides* or *over and above the creator*. Tis true, this is an *addition* to the *object* of *worship*, as *death* is an *addition* to *life*, *i. e.* *destruction* to the *oneness* of that, which ought *alone* to be *worshipt*, and admits no *rival* (*ye cannot serve God and Mammon*, nor *worship*

the *one God*, if ye impart and laviſh out that *incommunicable* priviledge to any other) and ſo *adultery* is an *addition* to the *object* of *marital love* and *fidelity*: But then what is this to the *prejudice* of *uncommanded ceremonies*? the uſing of which *ſuperſtatutum*, the *Diatribiſt* is to demonſtrate to be *ſuperſtition*, for about that onely, he knowes, the *controverſie* is betwixt us.

19. The 3. *conceſſion* is juſt *parallel* to this, and in part the ſame, *ſuperſtitum cultus*, ſaith he, *the worſhip of the Worthies by heathens, or of Saints and Angels by Papiſts, is called ſuperſtition* Sect. 3. *moſt properly, why? but that it addes to the rule of worſhip.*] I muſt not repeate what was ſo lately ſaid, though the *Diatribiſt* will. Tis evident I affirm all theſe to be *ſuperſtition*, but the uſing of an *uncommanded rite* is none of theſe, what *heathen worthy*, *Saint*, or *Angel* is *worſhipped* or *idolized* by my *proſtrating* my ſelf in the *worſhip* of the *true God*, by my *bowing* at the *name* of *Jeſus* &c. As for the reaſon why the *worſhip* of *heathen Worthies* and *Saints*, and *Angels* by *analogy*, is called *ſuperſtition*, it is ſtrange again what care of *intereſt* can do. The reaſon, one would think, was viſible enough to the *Diatribiſt*, in the very naming of *ſuperſtitum cultus*, theſe *Worthies* and *Saints* are *ſuperſtites*, ſuppoſed to *live* after *death* (ſure that is the notion of *ſuperſtes*) and ſo the *worſhipping* of ſuch is *ſuperſtition*, and as the *Angels*, ſo the *ſouls* of the *Worthies* that thus *ſurvive* the *bodies* (and in the *heathens theology* are removed εἰς μακάρων νήσους, *to the fortunate Iſlands*, in the *Chriſtians*, to *heaven* or *paradiſe*, or *Abrahams boſome*) are ſolemnly ſtyled *δαίμονες*, and ſo the *worſhipping* of them is *δεισιδαιμονία*, and that is *ſuperſtition*. Is not this reaſon enough for the juſtifying the propriety of the uſe of a word, that it perfectly accords with the *origination* of it both in *Greek* and *Latine*? and then what need of his *capriccio*, [*why? but that it addes to the rule of worſhip*] Certainly ſo doth *ſacriledge* (even when it *robbes God*] *adde* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, in this ſenſe, doing ſomething which the *rule commands* not, no not *permits*, and yet that is not *ſuperſtition*.

20. The 4. *conceſſion* produced is yet more *ſtrange*. *A ſlaviſh fear* ſaith he, *of God, is granted to be ſuperſtition, becauſe fear of God being worſhip commanded in the firſt commandment, ſlaviſh fear is an exceſs of that*] and he hath adventured to cite the *ſections*, where a

wherein tis granted by me. §. 24. 25. of the *treatiſe* of *ſuperſtition*. Herein the *Reader* will eaſily ſatisfie himſelf by his own *eyes*; In a word, thoſe *ſections* ſay no *ſyllable* of *ſlaviſh fear*, or any ſuch matter (and yet the *Printer* hath not miſtaken his *figures*) all that they ſay, is this, that *ſuperſtitio* ſometimes ſignifies in *authors* any part of *Divine worſhip*, which in *obedience* to his *God*, or for *fear* of *vengeance* from him, any *worſhipper* doth perform, *a thing which every ſect likes in themſelves, but diſlikes in others of a diſtant worſhip, and ſo either honours or defames with the title as of ſuperſtition, ſo of Religion alſo*. Then, that it alſo ſignifies a *trembling fear* of *Gods puniſhments* due for ſinne, ſuch as the *Epicureans*, that denyed all *providence*, were willing to *ſcoffe* out of the world. And of this notion of *ſuperſtition*, and equally of *religion* among the *Epicureans*, and *Cicero* that took it from them, I had ſpoken there at large, from §. 14. to §. 20. to which I muſt remit the *Reader*, and onely adde what there I omitted, that all that is there obſerved would probably receive much light, if we could retrieve one *book* of *Plutarch*, which is loſt, and in ſtead of which I can now onely give him the *title* of it, περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον *of ſuperſtition to Epicurus*, differing (it ſeems, both by the *addition* of πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον, and conſequently in the *ſubject* of it) from that which is now extant of *Plutarchs* περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, which hath no conſiderable *aſpect* on *Epicurus*, or his followers and *Philoſophy*, either to *defend* or *accuſe* it. Of this ſee the *learned Gaſſend* in his *life* of *Epicurus*.

21. But to return, what pretenſe can there be thus to *change* my words in an *unprofitable* citation (when if it had been *ſlaviſh fear* in his notion of it, of which I ſpake, yet that had been farre enough from the uſing of *uncommanded ceremonies* or *inſtituting* of *Feſtivals*) and in ſtead of [*that divine worſhip which any performs in obedience to his God, or for feare of puniſhment from him, and which Epicurus deſired to ſcoffe out of the world*] to ſubſtitute *ſlaviſh fear* of *God*, or an *exceſs of that fear of God which is preſcribed as worſhip in the firſt commandment?*] Can it enter into any *Chriſtians* heart to think or ſay, that *Epicurus* was in the right in that part of his *Theology*, and conſequently that it was an *exceſs* of *fear* which *Epicurus* deſired to exterminate? This is to ſay, that all *religion*, belief of *hell*, infinite *puniſhments* apportioned to ſin-

ners in another world, are *excess* of *fear*, and (under the title of *slavish*) *criminous*, and to be *cast out*. This certainly was *Epicurus*'s meaning, and the verses in *Lucretius* demonstrate it, where he thus argues,

— Nam si nullum finem esse putarent
Ærumnarum homines, nullâ ratione valerent
Religionibus atque minis obsistere vatum.

If men should believe endless punishments, they could never resist the religions, and threatnings of the Priests. And who would have expected the *Diatribist* a favourer of this *sect*, as he must be, if this *fear* of *God*, which *Epicurus* called *Religion* or *Superstition*, be by him lookt on as an *excess* of that *worship* of the *first commandment?* for that was *Epicurus*'s very notion of it, placing his own opinion in the *midst*; and as on one side, downright *Atheisme*, denying any *God* at all, so on the other, *beliefe* of a *providence*, of *rewards* and *punishments*; which as the mother of *fear* or *perturbation*, and interrupter of the γαλήνη τοῦ βίου *quiet of life* (his great aim) and very * *injurious* to the *Gods*, he rejected as another *extreme*, under the title of * *Superstition*. But of this sure I have spoken abundantly, and did not foresee that Mr. *C.* was to be admonisht of this worst *principle* in all *Epicurus* his *philosophie*.

* *Quid enim interest utrum Deos neges an infames?*
* *Superstitio error in sanus, amandos timet, quos colit violat.* Seneca Epistol. 124.

22. Yet because he is fallen into it, under color of the ordinary *divinity* concerning *slavish fear*, and because mention of this *slavish fear* as of a criminous excess, and a branch of *superstition* recurres very frequently in these *Diatribæ*, I shall not resist the *invitation* of saying somewhat in this place, once for all, of *slavish fear*: By that I suppose he understands *fear* of *punishment*, as by *filial fear*, a *reverential obedience*, proceeding wholly from *love*, without any thing of *fear* in it. Concerning this *distinction* I shall first demand, whether it have any thing of *propriety* in it, *i. e.* whether *sonnes* may not *lawfully* and *reasonably fear punishment* from their *parents*, in case they shall deserve it, even the *greatest punishment*, *exheredation*, and casting out of the *family*, upon their continuing *disobedient* and *refractary* to their fathers *commands*, and whether this very *fear* be not so usefull to restrain the *excesses* of *youth*, and keep them within that *obedience*, that no *parent* will ever think fit that the *child* shall know or think that his *disobedience*, whatsoever the *degree* of it may be, shall

ſhall not be thus *puniſht*, and laſtly, whether it be not *duty* in the *childe* thus to *fear*, and proportionably whether this be not *applicable* to every *childe* of *God*, eſpecially being exhorted to it, *Heb.*4.1. *Let us fear leſt a promiſe being made of entring into his reſt, any of you ſhould ſeem to come ſhort of it* (adding thereto *Heb.*12.28,29.) and this *diſtinction* being founded in the likeneſs between a *childe* of *God*, and a *childe* of an *humane parent*: If this be ſo, then there can be no *fitneſs* or *propriety* in the *diſtinction* thus explicated, nor can the *fear* of *puniſhment* be *diſcriminatively* called *ſlaviſh*, not with *juſtice* defined an *exceſs* of *fear*.

24. *Secondly*, The *ſlaviſh fear* I ſhall ſuppoſe in the *Diatribiſts* notion to be ſuch as is in a *wicked* man, and then it muſt be either the *fear* of *divine vengeance* for ſin committed *formerly*, or for ſin at the *time* of committing it, or for ſin *before* he commit it; and I demand how any of theſe three *fears* can by a *Chriſtian* duly be called an *exceſs*, or with any *propriety ſuperſtition*? For ought not the *wicked* man to *fear puniſhment* for his ſins paſt, when *God* affirms ſolemnly there is *no peace*, *no peace* to ſuch? be not the *judgements* of *God* gone out againſt that man, and if that *Lyon roar*, ſhall not he *fear*, if *vengeance* be denounced from *God* againſt him, is it a ſeaſon for him to *caſt* off *fear*? or if he doth, is not this *carnal ſecurity*? and is not the *contrary* apprehenſion (i.e. *fear*) neceſſary to reduce him? in a word, are not the *terrors* of the *Goſpel* part of the *Goſpel*, and on purpoſe deſigned to bring ſuch a man to *repentance*, and can he be ſaid to *believe* the *Goſpel*, which believes not that part of it, or will they be motives of *Reformation* to him, if he do not *apply* them to himſelf, in reſpect of his preſent ſtate? and can he ſo *apply* them, who doth not *fear* the *execution* of *them*?

25. So at the very point of *committing* any wilfull *ſin*, ought he not to look upon it, as that againſt which the *wrath* of *God* is denounced, and can he do ſo, and *believe God*, and not *fear* that *wrath* may fall on him, and that as long as he remains under the power of ſuch *ſin*, he remains under the *wrath* of *God*? Are all the evil *abodes* of an *accuſing conſcience* in a vitious perſon, *exceſs*, nay is not the *contrary* the *higheſt* pitch both of *preſumption* and *danger*, the very *root bearing gall and wormwood*, to *bleſs him-*

ſelf in his heart, ſaying, I ſhall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of my heart, Deut. 29. 19.

26. Laſtly, *before* the commiſſion of ſin, when he enters into *temptation*, is not the *feare* of *hell* an uſefull *reſtraint* to him, is it not both his *duty* and his *bridle*, is there, or can there be any *exceſs* in that? ſhould he *fear*, or ſhould he *not fear*? If he ſhould not, then what can keep him from *running* into all *exceſs* of *riot*? ſhall *love* of *God*, or *virtue*? but the *wicked* man, as *wicked*, is ſuppoſed to have none of that in his heart: But if he ſhould, if it be his duty to *fear*, and to *fear hell*, in caſe he ſhall *thus* go on, then ſtill how can it be an *exceſs*?

27. The conſideration of theſe few things may perhaps give the *Diatribiſt* reaſon to change his minde concerning *ſlaviſh fear*, and no longer to think it an *exceſs* of *Religion*, nor, as ſuch, capable of the title of *Superſtition*.

28. The truth is, what is amiſs in ſuch *fear*, is a *defect*, not *exceſs*, a want of *love*, not any unproportionable *meaſure* of *fear*, *God* is made up of *goodneſs*, as well as *juſtice*, and the *Goſpel* compounded of *promiſes* as well as *threats*, and the *love* of *Chriſt* ought to *conſtrein* us, as well as the *terrors* of the *Lord* to *perſwade*, and he that hath a quick ſenſe of one, and none of the other, he is not an *exceeder* in *fear*, but *deficient* in *love*, and ſo ſtill the mention of *ſlaviſh fear* in this place, and frequently in the firſt *exercitation*, is very unapplicable to the purpoſe, for which it is brought, as an inſtance of an *exceſſe* of *religion*, or *ſuperſtition*.

29. Some little thing more I ſhall perhaps be forced to ſay to it hereafter, but this ſhall not be *repeated*, and ſo muſt be *remembred* from hence.

30. The 4th *Conceſſion* of the Dr. is obſerved to be this, that to *affirme God to command, when he doth not, is granted to be ſuperſtition, under the notion of nimiety or exceſſe, becauſe that man addes to the commands of Chriſt.* § 46.] To this I anſwer, that for them who are reſolved to have *ſuperſtition* taken in the ſenſe of *nimiety*, and in that ſenſe to be oppoſed to *religion*, as an *extreme* to the *mediocrity*, I did aſſign this of impoſing *commandments on God* (and ſo *obligations* on our ſelves, and others) which he never *gave*, as an *exceſſe* of *fear*, a being *afraid* of *God*, when we need not, and ſo proportionable to one notion of

of δεισιδαιμονία, ariſing from the conſideration of the word δείδω (which may ſignifie perhaps a *trembling*, and ſo *cowardly fear*, δειλία) in that *compoſition*, And if hereby I have gratified the *Diatribiſt*, and yeelded the *Dogmatizer* a *Superſtitious* perſon, I wonder why this might not have been taken notice of in my behalf, and ſo ſaved him the pains of *affixing* this *poſition* on me, that *exceſs* in *religion* is not well called *Superſtition*, which 'tis viſible, and by himſelf now confeſt, that in this ſenſe, I affirme it to be; ſee that 46. §. of *Superſtition*.

31. Mean-while the *Drs. hypotheſis* is ſtill ſecure, for this no way belongs to the bare *uſing* in the *private* man, or the *Magiſtrates preſcribing Ceremonies* in the *worſhip* of *God*, neither of them doing it upon pretenſe of *Divine precept*.

32. The very ſame reply belongs exactly to my laſt *conceſſion*, vouched by him, that to *place more virtue in things, then God or nature hath put in them, is granted to be an exceſs, becauſe it addes to the promiſes of Chriſt, and called Superſtition by me*, §. 45.] For this is another *particular*, which I allow to be an *exceſs*, and when it is not meer *folly* fit to be comprehended under the ſtyle of *Superſtition*, for this farther reaſon beſides thoſe which I there mentioned, becauſe ſuch *beliefs* as theſe are moſtly borrowed from the *heathen* δεισιδαίμονες, and are *remainders* of their *practices*, as S^t. *Auguſtine Ep:* 73. ſpeaks of the *ligaturæ*, *Execranda ſuperſtitio ligaturarum, in quibus inaures, &c. non ad placendum hominibus, ſed ad ſerviendum dæmonibus adhibentur, the accurſed ſuperſtition of ligatures, among which are the ear-rings &c. uſed not for the pleaſing of men, but to ſerve devills.* This *teſtimonie* the *Reader* may ſubjoyn, if he pleaſe, to the *Supellex* already prepared for him in this kind §. 26. of *ſuperſt:* and diſcern how far I have been from *denying*, what I am accuſed here to *deny*, and yet as far from *yeelding* him any *foundation* of *concluding*, that the *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals* of our *Church* are in the leaſt degree guilty of *Superſtition*.

34. And ſo much for his *ſecond diſcovery of cauſes* of my (*phanſied*, not *real*) *miſtakes*.

Sect. 5.

Sect. 5.

The innocence of Wil-worship. Analogie with voluntarie oblations under the law. Seeming Contradiction. The authority of Chrysostome *and* Theophylact. *The* 2d. *Commandment. Reducing all sinnes to the Decalogue. Addition to the rule, Worship of Angels. Other sinnes beside that of Dogmatizing.*

Num. 1. THe 3d. part of his *discovery* of *causes* belongs peculiarly to that of *Will-worship*, thus,

2. *The third*, saith he, *is, that* ἐθελοθρησκεία *or Will-worship, is nothing but voluntarie worship, as innocent as the freewill offerings &c.*]which *proposition* of mine I must suppose made up of these *two* parts, 1 that *Wil-worship* is nothing else but *voluntarie worship*; 2 that being so, tis *innocent*, and *as innocent* as *freewill offerings:* And in which part of these, *one* or *both*, the *mistake* lyes, I am not told, but both together *indistinctly* are proposed, as my 3d. *fundamental miscarriage.*

3. And then, as to the first, I cannot begin without some *remarke*, that it should be possible to be looket upon by this *Diatribist*, as a *paradox*, or *mistake*, or *miscarriage* in any man, and such as is meet to be noted, as the most *fruitfull* mother of many *more*, that ἐθελοθρησκεία or *Will-worship* should be affirmed to be nothing else but *voluntarie worship.* Where I have no farther appeal to make, then either to the *ears* of all men of *common* understanding, or to the *Glossaries* and *Interpreters* of words. For is there any the nicest *difference* imaginable betwixt *Wil-worship* and *voluntary worship*, save that in the latter [*voluntary*] is of a *latter origination*, from *voluntas, voluntarius*; but [*will*] though perhaps from the *Latin originally* is yet more antiently *infranchised* among us of *England*, I shall make short work of this, if it be taken for any part of the mistake, by desiring one favour from *Mr. C.* viz. that he will *translate* either the *Greek* ἐθελοθρησκεία, or the *English*, *Wil-worship*, into *Latine* for me; will it not surely be *voluntarius cultus*, and is not that being turn'd again into *English*, *voluntary Worship?* What can be more *evident* then this?

But

4. But it may be hoped that this was not my *miſtake*, but what follows, *viz.* that this *voluntary worſhip* is *as innocent* as the *freewill offering*. But it is not poſſible, that ſhould be the *miſtake* neither, for *freewill offerings* under the *Law* were certainly one *ſpecies* of *voluntary worſhip*, and ſo known by the title of ἑκούσια, *voluntary*, and therefore thoſe being *innocent*, tis certain that all the other *fellow ſpecies* of *voluntary worſhip*, bearing *proportion* with theſe and having no *circumſtance* to defame them, which the other had not, muſt needs be *innocent* alſo.

5. That thus it is, and this is the notion of the word in the onely place where it is uſed in the *New Teſtament*, *Col.* 2. hath allready been largely vindicated in the *Tract* of *Wil-worſhip*, which the *Reader* is requeſted to reſort to, and the *Annotation* on *Col.* 2. where many more evidences are added to it, which make it *ſuperfluous* to *adde* yet more in this place; Onely I muſt ſecure it from the *Diatribiſt's* ἀντιθέσεις or *objections*: And the firſt is by way of *velitation*, that it *ſeems a contradiction in adjecto, that voluntary worſhip and uncommanded ſhould be innocent.*

6. There is no end of diſputing about *appearances*; That may *ſeem* to *Mr. C.* which doth not to other men, and *Ammonius* tells me this is very ordinarily obſervable in *this* very matter, πολλαὶ γοῦν εἰσὶν αἱ δοκοῦσαι ἀντιφάσκειν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀντιφάσκουσι, *many propoſitions ſeem indeed to be contradictory, but yet are not ſuch.* But I ſhall ask, Is it what it *ſeems*, or is it not? If it be not, why was this mentioned by one, who can diſtinguiſh betwixt *true* and *falſe*, *colour* and *varniſh*, *reality* and *appearance*? If it be, I deſire to be inſtructed, what *Logician* hath ſo defined *contradiction* as wil any way accord to this *expreſſion*. Εἰς τὸ περὶ ἑρμην. *f.* 89.

7. The onely *definition* or *deſcription* of *contradiction in adjecto* that ever I heard of, is, when that which is *added* is *contradictory* to that which was firſt ſet, and *contradictions* we know are *affirmations* and *negations* of the *ſame* thing in the *ſame* reſpect, either *formally* which the *interpreters* of *Ariſtotle* call διαγώνιος *diagonial*, μαχόμεναι πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἀντιφατικῶς, *fighting one with another in direct forme of contradiction*, ὁ πᾶς τῷ οὐ πᾶς, the *enunciation* [*every man*] to the *negation* [*not every man*] or *interpretatively*, i. e. by certain *conſequence* or *implication*, as if I ſhould ſay, *Socrates is not a man*, here were a *contradiction in*

adjecto, becauſe in the *ſubject* of the *propoſition*, he that had the appellation of *Socrates*, was ſuppoſed to be a *man*, and yet in the *predicate*, that is *denyed* of him. But certainly here is no ſuch thing, either *formally*, or by *implication*, in this propoſition, *Voluntary*, or *uncommanded worſhip is innocent*;] Of *forbidden worſhip* this were true, for *innocence* to be attributed to that, were *contradiction in adjecto*, but there is a wide *difference* betwixt *forbidden* and *voluntary*, as wide as between *unlawfull* and *lawfull*, all being *lawfull*, which is *not forbidden*, elſe there were not *univerſal truth* in the *Apoſtles maxime*, that *ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law*.

8. I ſhall convince what I ſay by this plain inſtance, *Theophylact* ſaith of many men ὑπερβαίνουσι πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιταγμάτων that they *exceed* or *tranſcend many of the commandments*; I demand, Do they *offend* and *ſin*, and are *nocent* in ſo doing, or did that *holy* man think they did? Tis evident he did *not*; for he, after his manner, borrows from, and tranſcribes * *Chryſoſtome*, and in ſtead of πολλὰ *many*, he reads πνευματικὰ the *ſpiritual*; They, ſaith he, *do many things with deſire and appetite, and manifeſt it* τῷ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ ἐπιτάγματα, *in that they do even exceed the commands*; It appears therefore that to theſe two *holy* and *learned men*, it *ſeemed* not, what to Mr. *C.* it *ſeems*, that there is *contradiction in adjecto*, in affirming *voluntary* and *uncommanded worſhip* to be *innocent*. A multitude of the like *teſtimonies* are put together in the *Annotat.* on *Col.* 2. which may be ſufficient to juſtifie me from *ſingularity*, that I diſcern not the phanſied *ſeeming contradiction*.

* In Rom. 8.

9. But this *affirmation* again of the *Diatribiſt* will not want its *proofs*; *four*, that pretend to that title, are here annexed.

10. For 1. ſaith he, *It's expreſſely againſt the* 2^d. *commandment which forbids all worſhip not expreſly commanded by God*] I muſt not complain of my *eyes*, or other *faculties*, becauſe they are the beſt that *God* hath given me; but I may wiſh for ſuch ſupplies as Mr. *C.* hath met with, for elſe I am ſure I ſhall never ſee the leaſt *glimpſe* of that which he mentions ſo expreſſely out of the 2^d. *Commandment*. What is *expreſſely againſt the* 2^d. *Commandment*, ſhould, me thinks, oppoſe ſome *expreſſe words* in it, and then it muſt follow that there are ſuch *expreſſe words* there, which

which *forbid all worſhip not commanded by God*, and this not onely as by *worſhip* are meant the *ſorts* and *ſpecies* of *worſhip*, but the very *acceſſaries* and *ceremonies* of *worſhip*, and all the *expreſſions* and *emanations* of the *inward* fulneſs of the *religious* heart. But my *Optick Glaſſe* will not afford me any ſuch *proſpect* in the 2d. *Commandement*: All ſorts of *graven images*, and ſuch like, I have there a fair *view* of, and an *expreſs* ſevere interdict of *worſhiping* them, but for all *kinds* and all *circumſtances* of *worſhip* which are *not commanded*, *kneeling*, *proſtrating* the *body* to the inviſible true *God*, the *times* and *degrees* of ardency of *worſhip*, the *abſtinencies*, *ſelf-denyals* atendant on it, ſure there is nothing ſaid *expreſſely* there, either to *command* or *forbid* them, and for any *general* comprehenſive *phraſe*, that can rationally contein a prohibition of all which is *not commanded*, I can ſay no more, but that the firſt verſe of *Geneſis* or any other in the *Bible*, hath as much of this to my eye, as the 2d. *Commandment*.

11. The buſineſs we are all this while upon, is, the *diſcovering* of *cauſes* of *miſtakes*, and therefore I muſt be excuſed again, upon the ſcore of the *example* before me, if I once more attempt to ſhoot my *ſhaft*, and by this firſt argument paſs my *conjecture* of the *cauſe* of the *prefacers miſtake* in this matter. It is the ſolemn *practiſe* of ſome *Caſuiſts*, to reduce all ſins in the world to ſome or other of the *Commandments* of the *Decalogue*; wherin I am not ſure that they have aim'd aright, for ſeparate *gluttony* and *drunkenneſs* (as ſure they may be *ſeparated*, and yet continue to be ſins) from ſome accidental *conſequences* of them, as *waſting* of *health*, which may aſſign either of them to the 6t. *Commandment*, and the like, and you will hardly tell whither to reduce the *intemperate* uſe of the *creature*; And ſo for that ſort of *lying* or *falſe ſpeaking* which is no way *hurtful*, or deſigned to be *hurtful* to the *neighbour*, and many the like inſtances might be given. But on this I inſiſt not with any *concernment*, but leave it to prudent conſideration, what *neceſſity* there is, that all *laws natural* and *poſitive divine* ſhould be reduced to one or more of theſe 10. *Commandments*. This is not that which I meant to ſay, but farther to offer it to *conſideration*, whether it be not viſible, that thoſe *Caſuiſts* which have *erred* in judging the *unlawfulneſs* of ſome things, have not eaſily been induced to *reduce* them to

ſome or other of the *Commandments*, as offences againſt the *affirmative* or *negative* part, and if not againſt the *words* or *ſenſe*, yet againſt the *Analogie* of it.

12. According to this practice it is moſt neceſſarily *conſequent*, that he that hath been poſſeſt of the *unlawfullneſs* of *ceremonies* and *worſhip uncommanded*, and hath not ſo far conſidered, as to rectifie his *judgement* in that matter (by weighing this one thing, that whatſoever is not *forbidden* is *lawful*, not, whatſoever is *not commanded* is *unlawful*) muſt whenſoever he ſhall write *caſes* of *conſcience*, or *comment* on the *Decalogue*, reduce this to ſome *interdict* under one of the *ten* heads, and all the other *nine* renouncing it, force it in by ſome appearance of *analogie*, to the 2d. *Commandment*; And then it falls out, that ſo many men, *diſaffected* to the *Government* and *Ceremonies* of the *Church* of *England*, have written on the *Commandments*, that it can be no more matter of *wonder*, that *uncommanded worſhip* ſhould be crowded in to the 2d. *Commandment* (and there long agoe imbibed by the *Diatribiſt*, and never queſtioned ſince) then that Mr. *Brightman* ſhould find the *Church* of *England* of this age, among the ſeven *Cities* of *Aſia* in St *Johns* time, or that Mr. *Parker* ſhould make the *uſing* the *croſs* in *Baptiſme*, a breach of every one of the *ten Commandments*, and branch a book in *folio*, into the *Atheiſme*, as I remember, I am ſure, the *Idolatrie*, the &c. till at laſt, the *concupiſcence* of the *Croſs*.

13. And then I ſhall but aſk this *Diatribiſt* whether he can heartily believe that the uſe of that *ceremonie* was really guilty of all thoſe ſeveral *tranſgreſſions* of the *Law* of *God*, and if he ſhall ἐπίχειν, beſeech him to *examine* over again his own *affirmation* here, 1. Whether any one man hath ſaid ſo fully what here he hath, that *voluntary* and *uncommanded worſhip* is *expreſſely againſt* the 2d. *Commandment* (they that onely *reduce* it thither, fall ſhort of him) 2. Whether they that have thought fit to *refer* it thither by *reduction*, have produced any *cogent* or ſatisfactory *reaſon* for ſo doing, and the next time he affirmes this from them, annex the *reaſon*, ſuch as may juſtifie a moſt rigid *concluſion* to the *conſciences* of all others who may be concerned in it, either in order to their own *practice*, or the *judging* of others. And I ſhall not farther exagitate this his *firſt proof*.

The

14. The 2d *proof* is the ſame we have had twice already, for the aſſerting the two former *affirmations, voluntarie worſhip is an addition to the rule of worſhip, and eo nomine Superſtition and that is ſinfull.*] But I have already ſhewed, that all *additions* to that *rule* are not *Superſtition*, and that all that is by any called *Superſtition*, is not *eo nomine* ſinfull, and ſo I am ſafe from that *proof* alſo.

15. So in like manner from the 3d, which is but another *repetition*, put in form of *queſtion* [*Why is the worſhip of Angels and Saints criminal? but becauſe it was invented and added by the will of man?*] This *queſtion* was anſwered long ſince, that the *worſhip* of all *creatures* is *criminal*; becauſe the *command* is *poſitive* and *excluſive*, that *God*, and *none* but the *one God* is to be *worſhipped*, and though the doing what is *not commanded*, is not a *ſin*, yet the doing what is *forbidden* muſt needs be *ſinfull*, and ſuch is the *worſhipping of Angels &c.*

16. What he here addes in the cloſe of this 3d proof, that they (I ſuppoſe, who *worſhip Angels*) *do not urge it as a commandment of God*] was ſure very unneceſſarily inſerted, For I never doubted but there are other *ſins* beſides *dogmatizing*, and can now promptly ſuggeſt to him competent ſtore of *inſtances*; ſure the *murtherer* is a *ſinner*, though he *teach* it for a *doctrine* from *heaven*, that it is *lawfull* to *kill* his *brother*, *&c.* And then why ſhould not the *worshipper* of *Angels* againſt expreſſe *precept* (*Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me, Thou ſhalt not bow down nor worſhip*) be a *tranſgreſſer* of that *Commandment*, though he *oblige* not, as from *God*, any other man to do the like?

17. His laſt proof is *ab incommodo*, *If wilworſhip*, ſaith he, *be innocent, I cannot ſee how all that rabble of Superſtitious worſhip at Rome can be condemned, for they are not held out as Commandments of God, but traditions of men*] The *anſwer* laſt given to the *appendage* of the 3d *proof* is ſufficient to this alſo. Other faults there may be in *worſhip*, beſide *holding it out as the Commandment of God*. It may for the *object* of *worſhip* take in ſomewhat beſide *God*, or for the *ceremonies* it may multiply them unprofitably, *ridiculouſly*, or it may be, pretend more *virtue* in them, then really belongs to them, and many the like. But theſe I mention, becauſe if it be true, what is here ſuggeſted, that the

worſhip at Rome, is really *ſuperſtitious*, and that there is a *rabble* of that *worſhip* there, as is ſuppoſed in the *queſtion*, the *anſwer* is already given by the very *propoſal* of it, and hath without any *violence* to my *hypotheſis*, which undertook not to juſtifie all, or any other *Churches* in their *worſhip*, but onely that of *England*, which is known to be *free*, where *Rome*, I adde, where the *Greek Church* in as high a degree as *Rome*, is guilty. And this may ſerve for the 3[d] grand *diſcovery* of *cauſes*.

Sect. 6.

The Lawfulneſs of inſtituting the Chriſtmaſs Feſtival. Of Church Laws.

Numb. 1. THe laſt ground of *miſtake* aſſigned by the *Diatribiſt*, is, that the *Dr. takes for granted, That a Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve worſhip not commanded by God, which remains upon him to prove before he can vindicate his Feſtival (as he and others maintain it) from the double crime of Superſtition and Wil-worſhip.*

2. If this *differ* from the *third* (as in reaſon it ought, elſe why ſhould it be *added* to it?) then the miſtake is not *onely*, or ſo much that I *affirme*, as that I *take for granted*, when I *ought* to *prove, that a Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve worſhip not commanded by God.* Now I ſhall at once *prove* my *affirmation*, and apply it to *my Feſtival* as he calls it, and ſhew that I have already *proved* it, and ſo not *taken* it for *granted*, as is here ſuggeſted.

3. For the former, I offer this *probation*, whatſoever is in it ſelf perfectly *free* or *lawfull* by the *Law* of *God*, and that libertie no way *retrenched*, that a *Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve*, But the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival* or *annual commemoration* of *Chriſt's birth*, is in it ſelf perfectly *free* or *lawful* by the *Law* of *God*, and that *liberty* no way *retrenched*, *Ergo*.

4. Of the *major* I ſuppoſe there can be no doubt, if there be, theſe *three conſiderations* will clear it. 1. Becauſe whatſoever is perfectly

ſectly *free* and *lawful*, that the *Church* or the *Chriſtian* hath *power* to do, unleſs that *libertie* be ſome way *retrenched* to him; 2. What every *particular Chriſtian* may freely do, that he may ſtill do, when it is by the *Church preſcribed* or *inſtituted*, elſe that *act* of the *Church preſcribing* ſhall render that which it *preſcribes unlawful*, being perfectly *lawful* before that *preſcription* (and if upon the moſt *Anarchical* principles, that ſhould be ſuppoſed to have any *reaſon* in it, then ſtill that *liberty* is ſome way *retrenched*, the contrary to which is ſuppoſed in the *major propoſition*.) 3. Becauſe the *Church*, meaning by that word the *Univerſal Church* of *God*, whether of the *Apoſtles* times, *including* them, *chief paſtors* thereof, or of the *purer* times *ſucceeding*, together with the *Governors* of each *Church* ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*, hath the power of *Stewards*, noted by the *Keyes* intruſted to it by *Chriſt*, and conſequently may *diſpoſe*, *order*, *inſtitute* for her members, in thoſe things which ſhe ſhall judge to tend to the *honor* of *God*, and to *edification*, though it be not immediately *commanded* (ſo it be not any way *prohibited*) by *God*.

5. As for the *minor* that the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival* is thus *free* and *lawful*, doth alſo appear by the no *prohibition* of *God's* in force againſt it, by the *lawfulneſs* of *praiſing God*, and *commemorating* the gift of *Chriſt* on *any* day (one or more) in the *year*, and conſequently on the 25 of *December*, by the *analogie* of other *Feſtivals* among the people of *God* in all ages, and by the *anſwer* to all *objections*, to the *contrary*, and the *evidence* of the matter, that this *libertie* hath no way yet been *retrenchd* by *God*, that gave it. And all this ſeverally cleared in the former *diſcourſes*, and the chief of them again vindicated here, by anſwer to the *Diatribiſts* pretended *diſcovery* of my *miſtakes*.

6. On which that I do not now think my ſelf obliged farther to inſiſt, by addition of *more evidences*, the reaſon will be ſoon diſcerned, by taking notice of the *one proof* which he here ſubjoyns to this his *laſt* ground, in theſe words. [*Which I prove by this one argument, If all additions to the word in matter of worſhip be criminous and ſinful, as prohibited by God*, Deut. 4. 2. *and elſewhere, then no man or Church can without ſin adde any worſhip to that commanded by God; But the firſt is true, Ergo.*] Where it ſeems the whole matter is devolved to that one iſſue, whether

whether the *text Deut.* 4. 2. and the 2^d *Commandment* (for there is not any *other* [*elſewhere*] any *other text* by the *Diatribiſt* produced to that purpoſe) be ſufficient to prejudge the *uſing* or *inſtituting* any *ceremonie* or *Feſtivall*, which is *not commanded* by *God*; And I hope this *ſuppletory* to thoſe former *diſcourſes*, which hath conſidered thoſe two *texts*, hath ſufficiently *convinced* that; And ſo there is no more now needfull to be *added* to this matter.

7. Thus have I traced this *Diatribiſt* through every branch of his *diſcovery* of *cauſes*, and ſhewed, I hope competently, on which ſide the *miſtakes* ly, and if there be no more *miſcarriages* in thoſe three *tracts* of *Superſtition*, *Wil-worſhip*, and *Feſtivals*, then this *Preface*, aſſigned to that work, hath *diſcovered* to me, I ſhall have no need farther to importune the *reader* with a *Superfluous vindication*, unleſs upon this ſcore onely, that tis poſſible that the *Diatribiſt* may not have ſummed up his *bill* aright, that there may ſtill remain ſome particular *miſtakes diſcoverable* by the view of the *particulars*, which are here omitted in the *foot* of the *account*, and then I muſt not take advantage of *falſe reckoning*. And upon this ſlender *account* I muſt now ſtill attend his *motions*, and ſhall do it, in confidence, that what hath been here, in *anſwer* to his *Preface*, ſaid ſo largely, will not be exacted of me again at every turn, by way of *Repetition*. On which ground it is evident, that I am to make no *return* to the remainder, which is the *recapitulating* of this *Preface*.

CHAP.

Chap. III.

Of Superſtition peculiarly. And firſt of his Prolegomenon on that Subject.

Sect. 1.

Anſwer to §. 1. The method uſed to find the meaning of the word.

IN his *firſt Diatribe*, that of *Superſtition*, §. 1. I may lightly touch and paſs over the diſlike of my *method* in writing of *Will-worſhip* before *Superſtition*, together with the *reaſon*, that being more *general*, this a *ſpecies* under it; for though it be certain, that I am not of his mind, that the *former* is a *ſpecies* of the *latter*, and ſo that I cannot admit of his *reaſon* of *change*, or that his is, as he ſaith, a more *juſt methodical order* of *tractation*, yet I ſhall not ingage in a diſpute of their *precedence*, but onely reply to the latter part of his *firſt* §. which directs the manner of inquiring, what *Superſtition* is, not *by ſearching into the monuments of heathen Authors Latine or Greek from the names or ſenſes by them given, as by the judgement of Divines &c.* *Num.* 1.

2. In *anſwer* to this I ſhall need no farther *reply* then to *remind* him, that as there is no better way to underſtand the full importance of *words*, then to examine them in their *origination*, and their uſage among the *beſt Authors*, *Maſters* of *words*, not only *profane* but *ſacred*, ſo ſure this is the very *method* I have taken, for δεισιδαιμονία (and *Superſtition*) viewing it in the *antient heathens*, in the *parts* firſt, then in the *compoſition*, and ſo alſo in the *ſacred Scripture* (which I hope is no *heathen Author*) as oft as it is found there, in *Lactantius* and S^t. *Auguſtine*, which ſure *knew what true Religion meant*, whatſoever he is pleaſed to ſuggeſt of my *way* and *Authors*, and are as competent *judges* of *Superſtition*, as his later *Divines*, that have reduced the uſe of

all *ceremonies*, not *commanded* by *God*, to the 2d *Commandment* (and to *Deut.* 4. 2.) under the title of *Superstition*.

Sect. 2.

Answer to §. 2. Amesius's *definition*. *The matter of the* 4. *first Commandments*. *The Affirmative part of the* 2d *Commandment*. *The Diatribist's misadventure about Duty in the midst*. *No prohibition of either holy days in the* 4th *Commandment*. Jeroboams *act*, 1 Kin. 12. 32. *The Rubenites altar*, Josh. 22. Naaman's *altar*. *Christmass Festival parallel to it*. *The excesses in each Commandment*.

Numb. 1. IN the 2d §. where he shews out of Dr. *Ames*: how *Superstition* may be fitly defined by *Aquinas*, *a vice contrary to Religion in the excess*, viz. *in order to the acts or external means of worship superadded by the wisdome or will of man, when a man tenders worship either to whom it is not due, or not in that manner which he ought*] he knows this, in the *obvious* sense of the *words*, such as from *Aquinas* was lately cited, is perfectly agreeable to my *affirmations* who make the *worship* of all but *God*, and the *worship* of *God* in any *forbidden* or *abolisht* manner, to be *species of Superstition*. But if by the *equivocal* phrase [*not in the manner which he ought*] he mean [*in whatsoever other manner, or rite, or circumstance which God hath not expressly prescribed, any appendant of worship instituted or appointed by man*] (and not onely any *worship*, as he cites out of *Amesius*, p. 4.) there is no truth in his *definition*, nor agreeableness to *Aquinas's* sense, as hath appeared formerly: Tis sure, *Aquinas*, which is cited in the *margent*, hath not owned any such *interpretation* of [*non prout debet*] to belong to all *uncommanded rites*. If *Amesius* have (which I have not commoditie to *examine*) then he was one of the *Casuists* which I forementioned, as the derivers of this *prejudice* into the *Diatribist*, and if *Ursine*, Dr. *Fulke*, Mr. *Perkins* are rightly cited in his *margent*, and their words extended no further then they designed them, then perhaps we have the

the full *catalogue* of them, and the *Diatribiſt* is now of age, to conſider whether they have *proved*, or onely *dictated* in this matter.

2. As for the grounds which are here laid by the *Diatribiſt* toward the evincing of it, they are no way *qualified* for ſuch a *ſtructure*. For when to the 4. *Commandments* of the *firſt Table*, he aſſigns theſe 4. things as the *ſubject* matter of them, *a right object of worſhip, God alone, of the firſt*; *a right matter, commanded worſhip, of the ſecond*; *a right manner, with all reverence, of the third*; *a right time, his own appointed day, of the fourth*; and thence concludes all *exceſs* in any of theſe *Superſtition*, there is ſcarce any one minute part of ſound *doctrine* in all this.

3. For in the *firſt*, which hath moſt of truth, yet this *failing* there is, that the right *object* of *worſhip* is not the principal matter of that *Commandment*, but the *worſhip* it ſelf, all the *parts* of that, having him for our *God*, treating him, *addreſſing* to him, as ſuch, and of this there is no *criminous exceſs*, which can be ſtyled *Superſtition*, the *Superſtition forbidden* in that *commandment*, is not any *extreme* or *exceſs* of *worſhipping* the *true God*, but the taking in other *rivals* to that *worſhip*, which belongs to the *true God incommunicably*, and ſo is the matter of the *negative* part of that *precept*, not the *nimiety* of the *affirmative*.

4. In the *ſecond*, there is not a word to determine the matter of it to *commanded worſhip*, as hath been evidenced beyond all queſtion. The *Subject* of the 2^d *Commandment* is the *prohibition* of *Idol-worſhip*; And *bending* the *knee* to the true *God* and none elſe, obſerving of *Chriſtmaſs* &c. are *remote* enough from that guilt.

5. As for the 3^d I had thought our *Saviour Mat.* 6. had given us the *ſumme* of it, *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but perform unto the Lord thy oathes*, the *negative* and *affirmative* parts of it, and then with what *propriety* can that be ſaid to denote the right *manner* of the *worſhip*, *with all due reverence*? Or if it ſhould be extenſible ſo far, then ſure all *ceremonies* that may expreſs that *reverence*, though not elſewhere *preſcribed*, will be here *commanded*, and then ſure not *forbidden* in the 2^d *Commandment*.

6. *Laſtly*, for the *right time*, *God's own appointed day* (the *Sabbath*, I ſuppoſe, he means) though that be *appointed* in the 4th *Commandment*,

mandment, yet ſure not ſo as to *prohibite* all others, we know there was a yearly *Sabbatick faſt* (the great day of *expiation*) ſo called *Iſa.* 58. 13. and many other *feaſts* beſide that of the *weekly reſt* in the 4th *Commandment*, ſome of *Gods* own *inſtitution*, others, as the *feaſt* of *dedication* of the *Altar*, in memory of the *purging* by *Judas Maccabæus*, inſtituted by the *Jewes* themſelves, and never mentioned in the *Canon* of the *old Teſtament*; and ſo the *faſts* of the *fift* and *ſeventh moneth*, *Zac.* 7. 5. And under the *new Teſtament*, the *firſt day* of the *week*, that certainly was not the *laſt*, which the *Decalogue* preſcribed, and why the *Apoſtles*, that inſtituted that, proportionably to the *weekly Sabbath*, ſhould not (either they, or their *ſucceſſors*) inſtitute *other* days, *feſtival* or *faſting*, proportionable to the like among the *Jewes*, ſure there is no manner of *prohibition* in the 4th *Commandment*, which *commanding* one day to be *hallowed*, and allowing the reſt for their ordinary labour, doth not yet *interdict* all others, or bind his own, or his peoples, and all *Chriſtians* hands from *preſcribing* or ſetting apart any other.

7. And there being ſo little ſolidity in the grounds, how can it be expected, there ſhould be any in the *concluſion*, as he ſaith, *anſwerably erected* on them, that *Superſtition may extend to the whole firſt Table*, or that every *exceſs* which he will phanſie *reducible* to any of theſe, ſhall ſtraightway commence *Superſtition*?

8. That he may farther perſwade this, one *obſervation* he commends to us *fundamental* to this *diſcovery*, but ſuch as I think never ſlipt from any man before him. His words are theſe, *The Commandments of God, having every of them a negative and affirmative part (expreſſed or underſtood) the duties of Religion do ſtand in the midſt, as virtues between two extremes.* Here I ſhall not queſtion the *corner ſtone* of this *foundation*, elſe I might demand, what is the *affirmative* part of the 2d *Commandment*, or how can it be evidenced that there is any, or indeed any more then a *prohibition* of *idol-worſhip* appendant to the *no other Gods* in the *firſt Commandment*, which ſtill is but a *negative*, or an *interdict*, or if an *affirmative* be to be underſtood, muſt it not be *bowing down* to the *true God*, and ſo that will not *prejudge*, but *juſtifie* all *outward decent geſtures* of *adoration*, aſſiſt, not oppugne our *pretentions*?

But

9. But in ſtead of this nicer *inquirie*, and ſuppoſing with him that every of the *Commandments*, hath its *negative* and *affirmative* part, I onely demand how he could think that the *duties of Religion ſtand in the midſt?* what I pray is the *antecedent* to which [*in the midſt*] relates? there is no other in the *period*, but [an *affirmative* and *negative part* of each *Commandment*] But do the *duties* of *Religion ſtand in the midſt of the affirmative and the negative part of each Commandment, as virtues between two extremes?* Then ſure the *affirmative* part of the *command* is one *extreme*, and the *negative* is the other, then what is *commanded* in the *affirmative* part, to that which is under *precept*, is an *extreme*, and ſo a *vice*, as far removed from *virtue*, as that which is *forbidden* in the *negative*, the *worſhip* of *one God*, a *vice*, as well as the *worſhipping* of *many*; *paying* to *God* our *oathes*, a vice, as well as *perjurie*; *perfect chaſtity*, a *vice*, as well as the moſt *proſtitute adultery*, and ſo in the reſt of them: what could have been ſaid more unluckily then this?

10. I would fain believe that the *Diatribiſt* did not mean thus, and therefore would attempt to affixe ſome other *poſſible* meaning to his words, as thus (without any retroſpect toward the *former* part of the *period*) that the *duties of Religion ſtand in the midſt between two extremes*, *as virtues ſtand in the midſt between two extremes*. But then to what purpoſe was the mention of the two parts, *affirmative* and *negative*, of the *Commandments* premiſed? for this I am ſtill to ſeek, and therefore muſt miſdoubt my σοφὸν φάρμακον, that it is not ſo fit for the malady as I could have wiſht, and yet I have no *better* to ſucceed it.

11. The beſt of it is, he hath not purſued this *obſervation*, nor made this *Superſtructure* in his *exemplification* thereof; the groſſeneſs of it would not permit that. But then to what purpoſe was his *obſervation?* ſure but to *amuſe* the *reader* and ſay ſomewhat demurely, which ſhould pretend to be a ground of his beloved *concluſions*, that *all additions to the rule of worſhip are exceſs againſt the* 2^d *Commandment, additions of ridiculous ceremonies or geſtures an exceſs againſt the* 3^d, *men's inſtituting other holy days and times, an exceſs againſt the* 4th. And truly what elſe he pleaſe, with as much appearance of truth, or *ſolidity* of argument, as theſe are inferred from either the *letter* of thoſe

Commandments, or from the ſolemne *obſervation* concerning the *affirmative*, and *negative* parts of them, and the *duties* of *Religion* in the *midſt*.

12. Tis true, all *worſhipping* of *Idols* is forbidden in the 2d *Commandment*, but how come all *uncommanded rites* to be *Idols*? All *perjury* (and (by *Chriſts* πλήρωσις) *voluntarie ſwearing at all*) is forbidden in the 3d *Commandment*; but how come *rites* and *ceremonies* and *geſtures*, though never ſo *ridiculous*, to be either *oaths* or *perjuries*, or to bear any *analogie* with, or by that means to be reducible to them? In the 4th *Commandment* the not *obſerving Gods* deſigned *Sabbath*, was a *defect*; but what words of that *Commandment* conclude againſt *inſtituting* other *holy days* and *times*, as an *exceſs*, and that *criminous*, not admittable among *Chriſtians*.

13. If any, it muſt be [*ſix days ſhalt thou labour*] but ſure that is not the meaning of them, but the *explication* is to be fetcht from the other part of the *period* [*and do all that thou haſt to do*] i. e. *all* thy *labour*, and *all that thou haſt to do*, ſhall be finiſht, as *God's* was, in *ſix days*, and no other day muſt be ſo ſet apart, as to take off from the *ſeventh* dayes *reſt* or *Sabbath*: but for ſuch *celebrations* as are reconcileable with that, there is no word nor appearance to the *prejudging* of them.

14. But the *unlawfulneſs* of this laſt is confirmed by the *ſinfulneſs* of *Jeroboams act*, 1 *Kin.* 12. 32. *He ordained a feaſt like unto the feaſt that was in Judea.* But the *Diatribiſt* cannot but know what it was that made that *criminous* in *Jeroboam*, his appointing this *feaſt* to be kept with *ſacrifices* at *Bethel*, which, beſide the *ſacrificing* to *calves* which he had ſet up, was alſo quite contrary to the expreſs word of *God*, which had commanded that *all ſacrifice* ſhould be *offered*, and conſequently *feaſts* kept at *Jeruſalem*, and no where elſe, ſee *Deut.* 12. 5, 6. 11. 13, 14. 26, 27. and *Joſh.* 22. 16. 19. 29. and *Joh.* 4. 20. This ſure was the *ſin* of *Jeroboam*, to ſet up *calves* in *Dan* and *Bethel*, to keep the people from *going up to Jeruſalem*, 1 *Kin.* 12. 28. 30. to make a *houſe of high places*, and *Prieſts* which which were not of the *ſonnes* of *Levi*, *v.* 31. and ſo in like manner a *feaſt like unto the feaſt which is in Judah*; and upon that *feaſt* day to *offer ſacrifice* upon that *Altar*, which he had made in *Bethel*, *v.* 33.

All

All contrary to that *command* of making *Jeruſalem* the *onely* place of *ſacrifice* and *publike* ſolemne *worſhip* to all *Iſrael*.

15. Nay had that ordaining of a *feaſt* by *Jeroboam* been ſeparated from that *appendant* ſin, of *ſacrificing* elſewhere then *God* had *commanded*, and drawing away the people from the *worſhip* of *Jeruſalem*, which was ſo ſtrictly under *precept*, I ſhall deſire to know, why that might not have been as blameleſs as the *Rubenites* erecting an *Altar* by *Jordan*, *Joſ.* 22. which though it were lookt on by their other *brethren* as an horrible thing, whilſt it appeared to be a *violation* of that *Law*, *v.* 12. and 16, 17. yet when it was truly repreſented to them by *Remonſtrance*, that this *Altar* was not built to divert them from *Jeruſalem*, or to offer *ſacrifice* on, *v.* 23. but onely for a *memorial* to their *children*, that they belonged to the *Lord God* of *Iſrael*, *v.* 24. 27, 28. and a means to keep up *Religion* in their *childrens hearts*, *v.* 25, 26. then it was juſtified in the ſight of all *Iſrael*, *the thing pleaſed the people, and they bleſſed God &c.* v. 33.

17. And why may not a *Chriſtian feſtival*, inſtituted in like manner as a *memorial*, not to *draw off* any mans heart from any *part* of *God's preſcribed worſhip*, be as *innocent* as this? And ſo our *jealous brethren*, the *Diatribiſt* and thoſe of his perſwaſion, that came out to *diſpute* againſt us, imitate them, and lay down that deſign, and *go back to their houſes in peace?*

18. To which purpoſe one thing more may yet fitly be added, that *Jeruſalem* being the *place* of *worſhip*, preſcribed by *expreſs precept* to all the *Jewes*, but not ſo to all other *pious* people of the world, though even to them alſo, *to all people*, it was a *houſe of prayer*, if they would make uſe of it (and accordingly we read of *heathens* that came to *Jeruſalem* to *worſhip*) yet this *precept*, which, as ſuch, lay on the *Jewes*, being not obligatory to the *Gentile proſelytes*, we know, *Naaman* built him an *Altar* in his own *country*, and there offered unto the *God* of *heaven*, and was ſo far approved in this, that the *Prophet* himſelf allows him the *mules loade* of *earth* to be carried out of *Judea* to the *erecting* of it. And I am perſwaded the *analogie* will hold exactly, as to the matter in hand, to a *Chriſtian feſtival* inſtituted by the *Church* of *Chriſt* which was never bound up to any *preſcript* number of days for the *worſhip* of *Chriſt*, whatſoever can

can be deemed of the *Jewes*, who, though required to do all according to the *pattern* in the *Mount*, had yet the *liberty* of *instituting* a *day* for *God's* service, as is evident by the ἐγκαίνια.

19. And so whatsoever the *Diatribist* can phansy in the *conclusion* of his 2d §. of the possibility [*that there may be Superstition in or against all the Commandments of the first Table in the excessive part*, and that *it were easie to observe, that many (Divines especially) do call the excesses of any Commandment by the name of Superstition*] yet I hope the observing of a few *blameless, decent, usefull ceremonies*, instituting a *Christian festival* for the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Christ* (*descensum venerabilis Dei ad humanæ conservationis rerum mortalium gratiam, the descent of a venerable God for the saving of mankind*, could a * *Philosopher* say upon the observation of the *star* at his *birth*) will not actually prove to be any of those *excesses*. And then I shall not need enquire what those *Reverend Divines* are, who have been so *liberal* of the *odious* title of *Superstition*, as to impose it (very *discreetly* and *charitably*) upon the *excesses* of any *Commandment*.

* *Chalcidius in Plat. Tim. p. 219.*

20. By the way, I am not sure that in every *Commandment* of the Ten, there are such *excesses*, I shall suppose *chastity* the *duty* of the 7th *Commandment*, and allowing *fornication*, *adultery* and *sodomie* to make up the *extreme* on one side, either in the *excess*, or in the *defect*, shall give the *Diatribist* leave to choose which it shall be, and supposing it must be the *defect*, (the *want* not the *abundance* of *chastity*) I shall desire to know what is the *excess* or other *extreme*, and whether that be by the forenamed *Divines*, placed under the *head* of *Superstition*, or indeed whether somewhat otherwise criminous; Thus it must be, if the *excesses of any Commandment* be so to be called, and if in every *Commandment*, not onely in those of the *first table* which had been *dilated* on before there be such *excesses* (and however the *analogie* holds for these of the 2d *table* as well as for them) of these he hath oft told us, that the *duty* is in the *midst* of the two *extremes*, how duely, will be discerned by *answer* to this *question*, and others, which will be soon ready, when he pleases to call for them, of the *same* kind.

Sect. 3.

Sect. 3.

The ſpecies of Superſtition, Idolatrie belongs to the 2d Commandment. Superſtition to the firſt. It differs from Wil-worſhip. The meaning of Illegitimate worſhip in Aquinas. His opinion of Eccleſiaſtical rites. Barbarous ceremonies of Baals worſhip belong not to the 2d Commandment. Holy days before Popery. Two antient Teſtimonies for them. The Jewes ſcrupuloſity in not reſiſting on the Sabbath day.

IN his 3d 5. ſome few things may be briefely noted. 1. That he wrongs *Aquinas* in ſaying he makes but *three kinds* of *Superſtition*, *Idolatrie*, *Illegitimate worſhip* and *Divination*, whereas it is moſt evident to any that will turn to the place in *Aquinas*, 2a 2æ *qu:* 92. *art:* 1. and *art:* 2. in *corp:* that he adds a *fourth*, *Superſtitio quarundam obſervationum*, citing out of St *Auguſtine* the *Ligatures* and ſuch like; And I cannot gueſſe to what purpoſe this was *miſreported* thus. *Num.* 1.

2. *Secondly*, where he ſaith of *Divines* that they refer *Idolatrie* to the *firſt Commandment*, the *Divines* he means muſt needs be thoſe that put the *firſt* and *ſecond commandment* into one (ſuch I ſuppoſe was *Aquinas*, and I had well hoped the *Diatribiſt* had not been of that perſwaſion) for elſe theſe words [*Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven image, &c.*] being ſuppoſed to make a diſtinct and 2d *Commandment*, no *Divine* can be ſo irrational, as to deny *Idolatrie* properly ſo called to belong to, and to be *prohibited* in that. And if it were true, what the *Diatribiſt* addes, that *Divination* is the *worſt* kind of *Idolatrie*, ſure that muſt be forbidden under the 2d *Commandment* alſo; But in this I ſuppoſe *Aquinas* was in the right, that made it a *ſpecies* of *Superſtition*, not of *Idolatrie*, and ſo it muſt more fitly belong to the *firſt Commandment*, and ſo muſt *Illegitimate worſhip*, being an offence againſt the due *manner* of *Gods worſhip*. But theſe are niceties that we are but little concerned in.

3. *Thirdly*, this quarrel to his own Dr. *Ameſius* for reſtraining *Superſtition* to *one Commandment*, which he will have ly *common*

to all the *four*, is certainly cauſeleſs; For the *worſhip* of *many Gods* (together with *Divination &c.*) and the *undue worſhip* of the *true God*, do certainly belong to one *Commandment*, viz. the *firſt*, which by commanding to *have no other Gods but* that one true *God*, excludes the *δεισιδαιμονία* or *demon worſhip*, and by commanding the *worſhip* of that *one*, forbids all *undue manners* of *worſhip*. That he underſtood by the word *Superſtition* no more but the tendering *undue worſhip* to *God*, was indeed an error in *Ameſius*, ſufficiently prevented, and diſproved, by *Aquinas*, and by the nature of the *Greek* and *Latine* words, and ſo likewiſe that he confined it to the 2^d *Commandment*, when in all reaſon it belonged to the *firſt*; But that being acknowledged his *error*, this other of not extending it to *many Commandments* is no way imputable to him.

4. *Fourthly*, when of that *ſpecies* of *Superſtition*, which he defines by the *vice of undue worſhip tendered to God*, he affirmes that it is more properly *Wil-worſhip*, this is but an *unproved* and improbable *affirmation*, quite contrary to *Aquinas* and his own *Authors* (as far as I can diſcern) *Ameſius* himſelf, and a *confounding* of things very diſtant.

5. *Fiftly*, when of *Aquinas's illegitimate worſhip* he gives his own *gloſs*, that he means that which is *not commanded by God, but inſtituted and appointed by men*] this is great injurie to that *School-man*; What he means by that phraſe will be beſt learnt from * *Aquinas* himſelf, who ſets it down diſtinctly by diſtributing it into two parts; For thus that 93^d *queſtion De illegitimo Dei cultu*, *Of the illegitimate worſhip of God*, begins, *Et ſuperfluitate & pravitate vitiatur divinus cultus &c. The worſhip of God is vitiated both by ſuperfluity, and by pravity; by ſuperfluity, if to the worſhipping of God ought be aſſumed, which neither by Divine nor Eccleſiaſtical appointment belongs to the glory of God nor to the ſubjecting either of the body or ſoul to the Creator; by pravity, if the external ceremonie contain any thing of falſity in it, which may fall out*, ſaith he, *two ways, either by the diſagreement between the ceremonie and the thing denoted by it, or by the publike miniſters uſing any ceremonie contrary to the cuſtome of the Church.* Thus far are the words of *Aquinas*: and what could have been more deſtructive to the *Diatribiſts*

* 2. 2 qu. 93.

pretenſions

pretensions then this description and branching of *illegitimate worship*, if either here or before, when *Aquinas* was cited, this sense of his, thus exprest, had been *considered?*

6. That he may never cite *Aquinas* again in this matter, I shall desire him to remember from that *School-man* these 4. things, his undoubted affirmations, by way of *Axioma*, 1. That *illegitimate*, is *vitiated worship*, and so more then *uncommanded*, certainly that which is *prohibited*, (and this according to the *propriety* of the word *illegitimum*, which signifies not *without*, but *against Law*. *Legitimum*, saith [a] *Chalcidius*, *est id quod legem sequitur, legitime is that which follows the Law*, or as [b] *Plutarch* defines νόμιμον, πρόσταγμα νόμου, & ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ὁρισθὲν, the *command of Law* or that which is *determined or commanded by Law*, adding, that those *good* things which yet are *not under precept*, are not to be called νόμιμα *legitime*; And so in *Leo serm*: 1. *de jejun*: 7. *mens*: *legitima* are opposed to *voluntaria*, as *commanded* to *spontaneous*. Now *what is Law*, saith [c] *Chalcidius*, *nisi jussum sciscens honesta, prohibens contraria, but a command requiring honest things, and prohibiting the contrarie?* And consequently *illegitimum* being the direct *contrarie* to *legitimum*, will signifie, in the *contrarie* sense to that which is *commanded*, that which is *prohibited* by *Law*.) 2dly. That the *superfluity* of it consists not in being *superadded* to *God's commands* onely, but to the *Churches appointment*, and so that which is ordained by the *Church*, though not by *God*, comes not under that style of *superfluous* or *illegitimate* upon that *score*. 3dly. That what tends to the *glory* of *God*, or to the *subjecting* of the *body* as well as the *soul* to the *Creator* of both, is neither *superfluous* nor *illegitimate*, so it be ordained by the *Church*. *Lastly*, that the *Ministers publike* using any *ceremonie* contrary to the custome of the *Church* (such is his *sitting* at the *Sacrament*, and the like) is a *pravity*, and that is worse then a *superfluity* in the *worship* of *God*. I suppose this may now be sufficient to arme the *Reader* against the *fallacies*, to which the frequent citations out of *Aquinas* might subject him.

[a] *In Tim*: p. 243.
[b] περὶ εἱμαρμ.
[c] p. 248.

7. *Sixtly*, That it is not to me imaginable how or why the *barbarous ceremonies* of *Baals Priests*, *&c.* should be an *excess* against the 3d *Commandment*, or a *taking Gods name in vaine*,

which we know is by *Christ* rendred *forswearing ones self*, and when they that *cryed* nothing but *O Baal hear us, from morning till night*, never used the *name* of *God* at all (for sure *Baal* and *God* are not *Synonyma's*) and so cannot be affirmed in *vain* to use it or take it.

3. *Seventhly*, That *dedicating holy days* to *Saints* (though *Christ*, whose *Festival* we treat of, be *more* then such) is neither fitly paralleld by the *Dicæribist* with *Jeroboam's feast* day at *Bethel* (as we competently evinced in the last *Sect.*) nor appropriated by him to *Papists*, when we know such days were dedicated to the memory of *Martyrs*, long before the *name* or *errors* of *Papists* were come into the world.

9. A competent evidence we have * formerly given from the *Epistle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, written on occasion of the *Martyrdome* of *Polycarpe*, St. *Johns* Auditor, where having described the passages of his *suffering*, they conclude with their wish and hope, that *God* will now permit them to *meet together with exultation and joy, to celebrate* τὸ μαρτυρίου αὐτοῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, *the birth-day* or *natalitia* (so twas styled) of his *Martyrdome*, adding the two great *ends* of such observations, εἰς τε τῶν ἤδη ἀθλησάντων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν, *for the commemorating of such Champions constancie, and the exercise, and fitting* of others for the *future*. The *circumstances* of that *Epistle* make it clear, that such *celebrations* and *dedications* of *days* were then of use before *Polycarp's* death, and that they now expected that this of his should be *added* to that number, and that so it was, I shall now adde a 2^d^ *undoubted* proof or *testimonie* of *Primitive Antiquity*, *antienter* then that of *Polycarp*, in the *Martyrdome* of *Ignatius*, written by them which were *present* at it, who setting down the day and time of his *Coronation*, say, they do it so precisely, * *ut secundum tempus Martyrii congregati communicemus athletæ, that assembling together on the Anniversarie of his Martyrdome, they may communicate with his Martyrdome, commemorate his sufferings and bless God for him, &c.*

* *Festiv.* p. 438.

Smyrn. Eccles. Epist. p. 28.

* *Martyrium Ignat.* p. 8.

10. These *authorisies* may, I hope, be of some credit with him, who can found *arguments* on passages in *Aquinas* and *Ameſius*, and if *Apostles*, as equitably as *Martyrs*, may thus be *commemorated*,

morated, the *Church* of *England* I hope (whatever become of the *Papiſts*) may be vindicated from all *Superſtition*, or *exceſs* againſt the 4th *Commandment*.

11. And then when I have added 8ly, that the *Jewes ſcrupuloſity* in obſerving their *Sabbath*, ſo that they would not *ſtand up to defend themſelves in that day*, is none of the *exceſſes* we are guilty of, and that this being by the *Diatribiſt* ſtyled *exceſs* of *Religion*, and that againſt the 4th *Commandment*, and *juſtly called Superſtition*, there is no need of making any *more ſpecies* of that *exceſs*, or forcing in all *dedication* of *holy days*, into that place I ſhall not need look any more narrowly to ſpy out greater *ſtore* of *infirmities* in that 3d *Sect.*

Sect. 4.

The Diatribiſt's method and caution in ſetting down the ſpecies of Superſtition.

BUT becauſe all the *former* methods were *imperfect* and unſufficient (even before they were *confuted*) to erect ſuch a modelled notion of *Superſtition* as would ſerve the *Diatribiſts* aimes, he muſt now in his 4th *Sect.* become *humble*, in ſtead of *Magiſterial*, implore the courteous *Readers pardon, if he be not ſo logically accurate, to ſet down* (what he is reſolved is *not eaſie to diſcover*) *all the kinds and wayes whereby this ſin of Superſtition is committed in particular.* *Numb.* 1.

2. And to what purpoſe all this *modeſty* is deſigned, will be eaſily gueſt, *viz.* to leave the word *Superſtition* in the *clouds*, to *involve*, in ſtead of *explaining* it, that it may continue *uſefull* to him, as a *mormo*, whenſoever he hath a mind to *affright* men out of their *obedience* to the *Church*, to which purpoſe it could not be ſo commodious, if it were once *defined* or *limited* to one or any *ſet* number of more *Commandments*. And though in the 10. following *Sections* he reckon up pretty *ſtore* of *ſpecies* of it, yet he muſt here before-hand make ſure of a *reſerve*,

proteſt his *libertie* to adde more, whenſoever he ſhall have *need* of them [*we ſhall*, ſaith he, *labour to expreſs ſome of them, as we find them held out by Divines and others*] where it ſeems *Divines*, ſuch as *Ameſius*, *Urſine*, Mr. *Perkins* &c. have not *held out enough*, but he muſt have a *ſupply* from *others*, which are not *Divines*, (and it would be an odde *queſtion* to be anſwered, who thoſe *others* are, when the *monuments* of *heathen authors*, *Latine* and *Greek* have been ſo ſeverely diſclaimed in his §. 1. and then none but the judgement of *Divines* thought fit to be *appealed* to in this matter) and §. 14. when he hath *completed* a large *catalogue*, he concludes with [*Laſtly to adde no more*] intimating that there are ſtill *more* to be added; of which he will ſerve himſelf, when he ſees good.

2. What now follows in the 10. inſuing *Sections*, I ſhall reſolvedly paſſe over, though there be many things very fit to be noted in them, partly becauſe he promiſeth they ſhall ſoon *recurre* again, and partly becauſe they belong to the other *tracts*, that of *Wil-worſhip* and *Feſtivals*, where ſure we ſhall meet with them; and partly becauſe they have been ſpoken to *already*, and beſides, ſome of them are the *enumerating* of thoſe very *ſpecies* of *Superſtition* which I have ſet down in that *treatiſe*, as ſuch. And therefore ſo much (after his *Preface*) for his *Prolegomena*.

CHAP.

Chap. IV.

Of the Particular exceptions of the Diatribiſt to the Tract of Superſtition.

Sect. 1.

Confidence of innocence no argument of guilt.

Numb. 1. I Am now more immediately *ſummoned* and called into the *liſts* by this *Diatribiſt* §. 15. and the ſeverall *Sections* of the *Treatiſe* of *Superſtition* muſt be brought to a ſtrict *examination*, and I hope they will not be unable to bear it.

2. In my firſt §. there is nothing *diſliked*, but onely that I will not acknowledge my ſelf or our *Church guilty*, before the *trial*, and to that purpoſe I am told [*commonly thoſe that are moſt Superſtitious are moſt confident of their innocency and piety, and no marvaile if they underſtand Superſtition as the Dr. doth.*]

3. But to this I anſwer, that I hope this his *prudent Aphoriſme* is not *ſimply convertible*, viz. That they which are moſt *confident* of their *innocency* and *piety*, are moſt *Superſtitious* (for if it be, I muſt not be ſo unkind to wiſh, or ſo *uncharitable* to believe of the *Diatribiſt*, that he hath a *good conſcience*, nor any longer rely on that *Apoſtle* that hath taught me *Gods* method of *judging* of us, by the *verdict* of our own *accuſing* or *excuſing conſcience*) and ſo long tis poſſible that I may be *free* from that *guilt*, though I am never ſo *confident*. Mean while I that allow the *Diatribiſt* one *ſpecies*, that of *Negative Superſtition* for his *portion*, have his leave to *conclude* from hence, that this is the *reaſon* why he is ſo *confident* of his *innocence*.

4. As for the 2[d] part, my underſtanding of the notion of the word *Superſtition* in that Treatiſe, if I cannot juſtifie it to be as good as Mr. *C.* his *ſuperſtatutum*, I ſhall very much accuſe my ſelf, and in the interim be comforted with his *confeſſion*, that if I have not

erred

erred in the *notion* of *Superſtition*, of which he is no *competent* judge, being a *party*, then both I and our *Church* (for the *Romiſh* I ſhall not be ſo ſollicitous) are farre enough from this crime.

Sect. 2.

The nature of the word. Exceſs of fear among the Epicureans, Superſtitio from Super and ſto, not ſtatuo. Aquinas miſreported.

Numb. 1. THe next or 16th §. conſiders the notion by me given of the *Latine Superſtitio, Superſtitum cultus*, and having yeelded it to be ſo defined by the *heathens*, yet he cannot think that I will ſay, that *that this is the onely Superſtition to be found in the world*, becauſe I *acknowledge an exceſſive fear of the Deity to have been another kind* of it among the *Heathens*, and other kinds alſo among *Chriſtians*, adding that *ſome there are, and they no mean ones, that derive it from Super and ſto or ſtatuo, as ſupra ſtatutum, worſhip inſtituted by men above the ſtatute Law of God*, but he rather reſts in the *definition* of the *Schooles*, that it is *a vice contrary to Religion in the exceſs which may extend to the other commandments, whereas this limits it to the* 2d.

2. To all this I need no farther to reply, but 1. That my 2d *Sect.* was not deſigned to give any *complete definition* of *Superſtition*, but to ſearch how much was to be concluded from the *Latine* word, as in the following *Sections* how much more from the *Greek*, and then to make uſe of all other proper means, the uſe of the word in *Scripture* and *Fathers*, to collect the *full importance* of it; and conſequently, if what I vouched out of the *Latine origination* be true, there is no more to be expected of my 2d §. 2dly. That I no where grant an *exceſſive fear* of the *Deity* to have been *another kind of Superſtition*, among the *heathens*, but onely that *ſome heathens*, eſpecially the *Epicureans* which denyed all *providence* and *judgement to come*, and *ſcoft* at all *fear* of *puniſhment* for *ſin*, affixt to this the name as of *Superſtition*, ſo of

of *Religion* alſo, whereupon I thought it reaſonable that we ſhould *not* (not that we *ſhould*) take our notion of *Superſtition* from them, which yet it ſeems the *Diatribiſt* is content to do, and ſo with the *famiſhing prodigal* to herd himſelf among the *Epicureans*.

3. Having thus ſecured my ſelf (as far as pertains to this §.) I may now be allowed to conſider the *Diatribiſt*, and then I find in theſe few words a competent number of *infirmities*. 1. That mentioning their *Etymologie* of *Superſtition*, who will have it *ſuper ſtatutum*, he makes them derive it indifferently from (*ſuper*, and) *ſto* or *ſtatuo*, as if thoſe two were *Synonyma*, whereas certainly [*to ſtand*] is competently diſtant from [*to make laws* or *ſtatutes*] and if it be derived from the *one*, it is not from the other.

4. 2dly. That deriving it from *ſto*, he doth not diſcern that this is my way of *derivation*, for ſure *ſuperſtes* is from *ſuper* and *ſto*, and ſo he confirmes my *origination* of the word, whileſt he thinks he *confuteth* it, *abſolves* very frankly, whom he ſat down on purpoſe to *condemne*.

5. 3dly. That his forſaking the *etymon* from *ſuper ſtatutum* to which ſo oft he had expreſt *kindneſs*, was again on an undirect aime, that he might get more *advantage* to his *hypotheſis* by that means, not moved with the *abſurdity* of the *derivation*, but meerly that he might have more *liberty* to range in, by ſerving himſelf on a notion of *Superſtition* qualified to extend it to all the *Commandments* of the *firſt table*, which how thoſe (*no mean ones*) whom for his own ends he hath now *deſerted*, will take at his hands, I leave him to conſider.

6. 4^thly. That having rejected the *derivation* from *ſuper* and *ſto*, or *ſtatuo*, he hath ſubſtituted no other, and ſo left a *rivulet* without a *ſpring*, a *compound derivative* without an *original*, a *monſter* in *art*, as well as *nature*.

7. 5^thly. That making uſe of the *Schooleman's definition*, he *extends* it much farther then he knows that *Schooleman extended it*, This he formerly confeſt §. 3. naming this *Learned Schooleman* as the *firſt*, who *came ſhort in aſſigning the ſpecies of Superſtition*, and here he more then *confeſſeth* it, extending *Superſtition* to all the *four Commandments* of the *firſt*

table, when he knows *Aquinas* made it a *breach* peculiar to the *first* of them.

Sect. 3.

Δεισιδαιμονία among the heathens for Religion, so in Hesychyus and Phavorinus.

Numb. 1. THe *question* of the 17th. *Sect.* concerning δεισιδαιμονία, what kind of *fear* or *dread* of a *Deity* was among the *heathens* noted by it, I have answered already, even that which the *Epicureans* would have driven out of the world, as making the *Gods cruel, tyrannical* &c. and accordingly in *Cicero*, *Superstitione liberare*, to *free* men from *Superstition*, and in *Lucretius*, *Religionibus*, from all *Religion* and *obligation* of *duty*, is explained by *metum omnem Deorum pulsum esse*, to have *all fear of the Gods banisht* from us.

2. If there be any other *minute* difference observable, it is this, that it is such a *feare* of the *Deity* as *wicked* men are in reason to have, (and that sure, though a great *trembling*, was yet no *excess*, no more then was very equitably the *portion* of such) so saith * *Diodorus Siculus* of *Bomilcar* δεισιδαίμονές εἰσι οἱ μέλλοντες ἐγχειρεῖν ταῖς παρανόμοις καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι, *they that are about to undertake any notable wicked actions, are generally afraid of the Gods or Dæmons*, and so still that will yield our *Diatribist* no aid toward the support of any of his *hypotheses*, sure the *instituting* of our *Christmass Festival*, was no act of such a just *dread* of *vengeance* for sin, nor *effect* whether *immediately* or *remotely* produced by it.

* l. 2. p. 779.

3. As for his *affirmation* that the *former part of the word* δεισιδαιμονία *doth not signifie worship, but fear, and not that fear which is oft put for the whole worship of God, but slavish fear &c.* this is a clear mistake; Tis true indeed it doth signifie sometimes a *trembling fear* (such as I said was the *wicked* mans *portion* and due lot, and so not an *excess*, or *unproportionable* to his *state*) as when *Plutarch* saith of him, he *wisheth there were no Gods*, but

but it doth not always ſignifie thus, but ſimply φόβος θεῶν ἢ δαιμόνων *the fear of Gods and demons*, and accordingly as *Phavorinus* in the *Epicurean* notion of it renders it περὶ τὸ θεῖον δειλία, *a cowardly fear toward God*, ἢ ὁ ἄλογος τῶν θεῶν, *or an irrational fear of the Gods*, ſo *Heſychius* renders it φοβοθεία *fearing God*, or *Religion* in *univerſum*, and the ſame *Phavorinus* explains δεισιδαίμων by εὐσεβὴς *Superſtitious*, by *devout* or *pious*, and addes, ὡς ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος *as Saint Paul* uſeth the word *Act.* 17, 22.

Sect. 4.

Falſe worſhip is not Wil-worſhip. Impoſition of hands.

HIS 18th §. being but an *approbation* of my *concluſion*, that δεισιδαιμονία refers to the *Poetical Gods, Angels*, or *dead men*, or indeed *any thing but the onely true God*, muſt not be reſiſted by me; I am glad I have once gratified him. *Numb.* 1.

2. But when he addes, that this clears what he had ſaid, that this is *rather idolatry againſt the firſt Commandment, which is Polytheiſme, then any kind of Superſtition, which is the giving of falſe*, i.e. *uncommanded worſhip to the true God againſt the* 2d *Commandment*, this is but a heap of *incongruities*; for 1. *Idolatry*, as hath been evidenced, is a ſin againſt the 2d *Commandment*, though *Polytheiſme* be againſt the *firſt*.

3. 2dly. Though *Superſtition* be the giving of *falſe worſhip* to the *true God*, as well as *worſhip* to *falſe Gods*, *Demons* and *Superſtites*, the *ſoules* of men departed (or a *dread*, which is not a *worſhip*, to the *true*) yet this *falſe worſhip* is unfitly explicated by *uncommanded worſhip*, For certainly all ſuch is not *falſe*, as out of *Aquinas* was cleared, eſpecially if the word *Worſhip* be extended, as this *Diatribiſt* extends it, to *rites* and *obſervances*, as well as to the *ſubſtantial* parts of *worſhip*; ſuch were *impoſition* of *hands* in *benediction* among the *Jewes*, continued alſo for many uſes among *Chriſtians*, yet never *preſcribed* or *commanded* by God; and many the like elſewhere mentioned.

4. And this therefore 3dly. cannot be truely affirmed to be againſt the 2^d *Commandment*, which alſo being ſpent upon the *worſhip* of *Idols* (all for the interdicting of that) cannot be properly ſaid to conſider the *worſhip* of the *true God*, (unleſs it be the *external* part, that of *bowing down &c.* in the *affirmative* branch of it) which had been the ſubject of the *firſt Commandment*; and to that in all reaſon all *falſe worſhip* of the *true God* muſt be reduced, and not to the *ſecond*.

Sect. 5.

δεισιδαιμονίστερους *Act.* 17. 22. (*The Athenians the moſt devout of all the Greeks.*)

Numb. 1. WHat he ſaith by way of *dilemma* §. 19. concerning the uſe of the word δεισιδαιμονίστερους *more Superſtitious*, of the *Athenians*, *Act.* 17. 22. [*If* ſaith he, *they were ſo called becauſe they worſhipt more Gods, then they were Polytheiſts, If becauſe they were devout or pious, rather impious in worſhipping the true God ignorantly in a falſe manner, then their ſin was againſt the* 2^d *Commandment*] though *true*, in ſome ſenſe, is yet nothing *gainfull* to his deſign, which can thrive by no other means but by getting δεισιδαιμονία or *Superſtition* to denote *all uncommanded rites in the worſhip of the true God*.

2. This it no way ſignifies in that place of the *Acts* but onely their *worſhipping* a *multitude* of *Gods*, *moe* then any other nation did, and the ἄγνωστος θεός or *unknown God*, for one, and ſo their being more *pious* in their courſe, then other their *heathen* country men were, or indeed then the *Romans*, or any elſe.

3. That this is the truth, and the whole *truth*, hath ſufficiently been evidenced in the Tr: of *Superſtition*, §. 11. and I now adde three *teſtimonies* more, to that heap, one out of *Joſephus*, *l.* 2. *Contra Ap*: Ἀθηναίους τ' Ἑλλήνων ἀνεσεβεστάτους ἅπαντες λέγουσι; All

All men affirme the Athenians to be the most pious of the Greeks. A 2[d] out of *Sophocles, Oedip:*

Ὅθ' οὕνεκ' εἴ τις γῆ θεοὺς ἐπίσταται
Τίμαις σεβίζειν, ἥτε τοῦδ' ὑπερφέρει,

If any know how to worship the Gods with honors (sacrifices and *offerings* to their *Temples) Athens excels them all*; The third even now intimated out of *Phavorinus*, but here more fully to be expressed, who having explicated δεισιδαίμων *superstitious* by εὐσεβὴς *pious*, subjoyns this *testimonie* of the *Acts*, ὡς ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος, δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. *as S. Paul saith, I see that you are more Superstitious*, the very place which we have now before us, brought by that *learned Grammarian* as an instance, that the word is there taken in a *good*, not *ill* sense, yet not of any *uncommanded worship* of the *true God*, but a *pious*, though *Ethnick devotion* toward the *multitude* of their *false*, *superadded* to the *one true God*, which though in a *Christian* scale or judgement it cannot be *approved*, because it is *Polytheisme*, yet *in comparison* with other *heathens* (which was *S. Pauls* business in that place) it was truly by him lookt on as a greater measure of *devotion*, then the rest of the *heathen* world were guilty of, and that is all that was meant by that *phrase*, and so tis not at all usefull to the end, to which the *Diatribist* would have inclined it.

Sect. 6.

Ζητήματα περὶ τ ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας Act. 25. Festus's scorn falls on the Jews, not on Paul. Τῆς ἰδίας his own, not theirs. Ζήτημα an accusation. Jesus put under the notion of a δαίμων by Festus. Ἀνάστασις taken for a damon. πεθνηκότος. ἔφασκε ζῆν. The Diatribists objections answered. Superstition for Religion simply.

Numb. 1. HIS 20th §. is an arraignment of §. 12. of *Superst.* concerning the place *Act.* 25. 19. *ζητήματα περὶ τ ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας* &c. which I had rendred, *questions* or *accusations concerning his own Religion* or *Superstition* or *Worship*, and (to explain what was meant by the word *δεισιδαιμονία*) *of one Jesus that was dead, whom Paul said to be alive, putting him under the notion of a dead Heros, and so meaning the worship of him by δεισιδαιμονία.*

2. Against this the *Diatribist* excepts in 3. particulars. 1. *It is like*, saith he, *Festus spake in scorn, not of* Pauls *onely, but of the whole Jewish Religion, as*, saith he, *the words may import, and are translated by ours.* 2. That what I said of *putting Jesus under the notion of a dead Heros or δαίμων, is a strein of Criticisme, compounding things which are in the Text distinct, for* Festus *sayes* (saith he) *they had many questions both concerning their own Superstition, and also concerning one Jesus, &c.* adding (to *confirme* this) that he was *accused of questions of their Law*, c. 23. 29. *and of sedition, seducement, profanation of the Temple*, 24. 5, 6. 3dly. That *Paul affirmed Jesus to be alive, not in part, as the Damons were supposed, but in the whole man, as raised from the dead.*

3. To these I briefely answer, and first to the *first*; For the *scorn*, it no way appears to be meant by *Festus* against S. *Paul* or his *Religion*, for *Festus* is at this time speaking in *favour* of *Paul*, and slighteth the *Jews accusations* of him, as matters of no *considerable* moment, and so, if there be any thing of *sarcasme* in the speech, it fals on the *Jews*, not on *him*, and so cannot set any

any *ill character* on the δεισιδαιμονία, in case that be S. *Paul's*, and not *theirs*.

4. As for the *Diatribist's phansie*, that the *scorn should fall not on* Pauls *onely, but on the whole Jewish Religion*, that cannot hold, for when he speaks of the *Jewes* charge *against Paul*, he cannot speak of that wherein *Paul* and they *agreed*, but wherein they *differed*, and that must either be *their* way, which *Paul* opposed, or *Paul's* way, which they now *accused* him of.

5. Now which of these two it was, is not determinable by the words in *Greek*, for the τῆς ἰδίας may either be rendred *his own* or *their own*; Yet that it must be interpreted *his*, I offer this *reason* to perswade, (whereas the *Diatribist* pretends to none for the *contrary*, but onely that *so the words may import*, and that *our English hath so translated*) The *Jews accusation* or *charge* against S. *Paul* is plainly mentioned in this place; That is the meaning of ζητήματα εἶχον πρὸς αὐτὸν, *they had questions* or *laid charges against him*; the word ζήτημα sometimes signifies a *charge*, *complaint*, *inditement*, so c. 18. 15. εἰ δὲ ζήτημά ἐστι περὶ λόγου, *but if the accusation* or *charge be of a word*; Thus *Satan*, who is so called, as ἀντίδικος an *adversary in fora*, διάβολος an *accuser*, is said ζητεῖν *to seek*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. (and *Luk.* 22. 31. ἐξαιτήσασθαι *to require*) i. e. to *accuse* and *charge* men, that so they may be *delivered* up to him as an *executioner*, to *winnow*, in one place, and to *devour*, in the other. So to *question* a man among us vulgarly signifies to *accuse* him, and that so it signifies here, appears by v. 18. οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον, *the accusers brought no accusation of the things which I supposed*, ζητήματα δὲ τινὰ, *but some questions*, that must be *accusations* again, αἰτιάματα v. 7. &c.

6. Whence, I suppose, it will follow, that the ἰδία δεισιδαιμονία περὶ ἧς *of which* he was *charged*, which is the *matter* of the *accusation*, or that wherein the *offence* consisted, was *his*, not *their Superstition*, for how could their *own Superstition* be the *matter* of their *charge* against him?

7. To the 2d, that what I said of *Festus* putting *Jesus* under the notion of a *dead Heros*, though it be of that nature that I shall not, because I need not, make it a matter of *controversie* with any, yet I had this consideration to incline me to it, the immediate

subjoyning

subjoyning of *one Jesus* whom *Paul* ἔφασκε ζῆν *contended to live*, to be *superstes*, as of their *Dæmons*, *Festus* and those of his perswasions ordinarily *affirmed*. To which purpose I remembred what the *Athenians* surmised, when *Paul* preacht to them *Jesus and the Resurrection*, Act. 17. 18. *He seems*, say they, ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, *to be a proclaimer of strange* or *new Dæmons*, where St *Chrysostome* judges it so manifest that those *Gracians* thought *Jesus* to be a *Dæmon*, that he addes, καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἀνάστασιν θεόν τινα εἶναι ἐνόμιζον, ἅτε εἰωθότες καὶ θηλείας σέβειν, *they took also Anastasis* (*Resurrection*) *for some Goddess*, *as being accustomed to worship females also*. And then why *Festus*, an *heathen* likewise, and which understood none but *heathen Theologie*, should not thus mean in words of so neer an *importance* that will bear it so fitly, I can yet see no *reason* to doubt.

8. Of this I am sure, that in the *one* proof offered to the *contrary*, the *Diatribist* hath strained more, then I have in my *Criticisme*, for 1. When he thus reads the *text*, *they had many questions*, that so he might make it necessary to distinguish the *question* concerning *his Superstition* from that of *Jesus*, he hath inserted the word *many*, there being neither in the *Greek* nor in our *English* any such word, but onely τινὰ ζητήματα *some* or *certain accusations*. 2dly. When (on the same design) he again reads [*both concerning their Superstition, and also*] there is no such word, nor any thing, either in the *Greek* or our *English*, answerable either to [*both*] or to [*also*] but onely thus, περὶ--καὶ--*concerning his own Superstition* or *dæmon worship*, *and one Jesus*, *which was*, or *had been dead*, so τεθνηκότος signifies, *whom Paul affirmed to live*; and 3dly. When he addes that he was *accused of questions of their Law*, c. 23. and of *sedition* &c. c. 24. this proves nothing, which the *Diatribist* would have, for though the *Jews* had thus *accused* him, yet he had *answered* for himself in the latter part of c. 24. and cleared himself perfectly from those *two* charges, from the *first*, v. 12. and from the *second*, v. 18. and so again, c. 25. 8. and so still it remains that in *Festus's judgement* (to which *Paul* appeals for the *knowledge* of it, telling him that he knew he was *guiltless* from having done any wrong to the *Jewes*, v. 10.) *Paul* was

was not guilty, nor ſtood charged of any thing, but onely of his *own Religion*, *and one Jeſus*, i. e. I ſuppoſe by way of explication (as [*καὶ and*] is frequently *exegetical*) of believing and *proclaiming Jeſus* and the *Reſurrection*, c. 24. 15. which laſt alſo being *common* to him with the *Jewes*, as there he conteſts, could not by them duely be charged upon him, and ſo the whole *charge*, and that which is the *characteriſtick*, diſtinctive note of *his Religion*, is his contending that *Jeſus was alive*, *who had dyed*, which how agreeable it is to *Feſtus's* notion of a *Dæmon*, I ſhall not need farther to declare.

9. As to the laſt, it is evident that he that affirmes *Jeſus* to be *alive*, both *ſoul* and *body*, doth to a *heathen* eare as much define him to be a *Dæmon*, as if he ſaid nothing of his *body*: However all that *Feſtus* here ſaith is, that ἔφασκεν ζῆν, he *affirmed him to live* now after he had *been dead*, and if to that we adde, that *Paul* preached his *aſcenſion* to *heaven*, what could a *heathen*, according to his *perſwaſions conclude* from thence, but that he had *attained* his ἀποθέωσις, which was all that they required to his being a *Dæmon*. And ſo much for theſe *objections*.

10. Meanwhile, if all were granted that is here deſired by the *Diatribiſt*, that the *Superſtition* ſpoken of was not S. *Pauls*, but the *Jews*, this could no way incommodate me, or hinder my *pretenſions*, in order to the main, for then, ſay I, it ſhall ſignifie the *Jews Religion* ſimply, without any character of *ill* or *good* laid on it, as in * *Quintilian*, *Primus Judaicæ Superſtitionis author*, *the firſt author of the Jewiſh Superſtition* or *Religion*, and in * *Ulpian* that *Severus* and *Antoninus* permitted thoſe to be *capable of dignities*, *qui Judaicam Superſtitionem ſequuntur*, *who follow the Jewiſh Superſtition* or *Religion*, and many the like.

* *l.* 3. *c.* 8.

* *Leg. Qui ad Temp. D. Decurion.*

Sect. 7.

The method of ſearch for the original notion of the word. Mr. Cawdries *collections from the heathens. Among them Superſtition all one with Religion. Plutarch of the Sabbatick reſt. Sacrificing children to Moloch, was not to the true God,* Jer. 32. 35. Lev. 20. 2. nor *a bare uncommanded worſhip. The gloſſes of the Etymologiſt and Phavorinus.*

Numb. 1. THe 21th. §. is a ſhort diſpatch of all that I had ſaid of the uſe of the word among other *Authors* from §. 14 to §. 27. All which *Sections*, though intirely deſigned to the *diſcovering* the true notion of the word, by that *norma loquendi*, the beſt *rule* to judge of words, the *uſe* of it among *writers* of all ſorts, are ſhortly *cenſured* as [*a great deal of reading and learning to little purpoſe, except to cloud the buſineſs, to lead men away in a miſt from the true and proper ſenſe of the word among Chriſtians.*]

2. It ſeems they which receive benefit by being in the *dark*, are apt to miſtake *light* for *miſts*, and the *Apoſtle* hath given the reaſon, ἐλέγχονται ὑπὸ φωτὸς *they are reproved by the light.* Tis certain the *Chriſtians* took the word whether *Greek* or *Latine*, from the *heathens*, which were before them, and accordingly to judge of the *propriety* of the uſe of it, I thought my ſelf obliged to ſearch to the *original*, i. e. to the uſe of it among the *heathens*, and finding the *Scripture* uſe of it exactly agreeable to their acception of it, from whom the *Scripture* had it, and ſo likewiſe the *Chriſtian Gloſſaries*, that of *Heſychius*, *Suidas*, *Phavorinus*, the *Etymologiſt* and others, I thought this had been to ſome other *purpoſe* then onely to *cloud the buſineſs*, And becauſe I continue ſtill in the ſame opinion, I refer the *judicious* Reader for three eminent teſtimonies more to the ſame purpoſe (out of *Diod. Siculus* of *Imilco*, out of *Heraclitus*, περὶ ἀπίστων, out of an *edict* of *Tiberius* ſet down by *Joſephus*) to the *Annotations* on *Act.* 17. By which, and thoſe already produced in the *Sections*, here thought fit to be deſpiſed by the *Diatribiſt*,

Diatribiſt, it is moſt evident that *Religion* and *Superſtition* were by them who were guilty of *daemon worſhip*, or when uſed of them by *others*, taken, as exactly *Synonyma*, words importing the ſame thing.

3. But againſt this the *Diatribiſt* conceives himſelf out of theſe very *Sections* to have gained ſomewhat to *object*, *It ſeems*, ſaith he, *the heathens did oft take the word in an ill ſenſe, and branded Religions which they did not like by that name. Plutarch taxes the Jewes for their Superſtition in two things remarkable. 1. That when invaded, they would not riſe from their ſeats on the Sabbath day, which was exceſs againſt the 4th. Commandment, and groſs Superſtition. 2. Their killing and ſacrificing their children to Moloch, which being an horrid Superſtition, was (as the former) intended as a worſhip to the true God, and yet was interpreted no better then ſacrificing to devils*, Pſal. 106. 37. *which though in other reſpects it was againſt the firſt Commandment groſs Idolatry, ſo in making it a worſhip of the true God (when he commanded it not, neither came it into his heart, as ſomewhere he ſayes) it was a kind of Superſtition againſt the 2d Commandment*; concluding in a *word*, that the *Etymologiſt ſpeaks fully his ſenſe, the word among the heathen is taken for a good thing, but among Chriſtians for impiety.*

4. How ſolid this way of *objecting* is, will now ſoon be diſcerned, 1. By remembring in the general, that at the beginning of the 5. the *teſtimonies* brought by me in thoſe *Sections*, were judged to be *to little purpoſe but to cloud the buſineſs and lead men away in a miſt*, and yet now he can expreſs kindneſs to ſome of the *teſtimonies*, as thinking they may be uſefull to his pretenſions, which aſſures me all the other might have been capable of the like *favour* and friendly *reception* from him, if they could any way have been perſwaded to do him ſervice.

5. 2dly. To the *heathens* taking the word in an *ill ſenſe*, the *anſwer* is moſt obvious, ſo they did *Religion* too, and indifferently *either*, when either they that ſpake were *Epicureans*, *enemies* to all *Religion*, or when the *Religions* they ſpake of were *diſliked* by them, and ſo ſure that proves nothing for the *Diatribiſt*.

6. 3dly. This is the *anſwer* alſo to what is obſerved from *Plutarch*, for he ſpeaks of the *religions* which he *diſliked*, the *Jewiſh* was one of them, and particularly their *obſervation* of *Sabbatick*

rests to the ruining their City, which he thought their *Religion* had bound them to, and never dreamt that they had mistaken their *Religion*, or that their 4th *Commandment* allowed them greater *liberty*.

7. 4thly. That *Plutarch* mentions the *killing* and *sacrificing* of *children*, he took that also for a part of some mens *Religion*, and thought he had reason to be dissatisfied with it, and to make it an instance of the *Quantum Religio potuit, how much evil Religion did in the world*, still making no *distinction* betwixt *Religion* and *Superstition*. But here by the way the *Diatribist* hath a little mistaken, in thinking that this *bloody worship* in *sacrificing* their *children* to *Moloch* was as the former (*i.e.* as that of the *strict Judaical rest* in time of *invasion*) intended as a *worship* to the *true God*.

8. Certainly *Moloch* was no *true God*, but *a false*, the *abomination of the children of Ammon*, 1 *Kin.* 11.7. and 2 *Kin.* 23.13. thought by *learned* men to be a deified *King* of the *Ægyptians*, and so a *damon*, placed among the *starres*, the same that others make the *planet Mars* (see *Kircheri Prodromus Coptic.* 1.5.) and that *sacrifice* was the giving their *seed* to *Moloch* that *false God*, *Lev.* 20.?,3,4. or the *making their sonnes and daughters pass through the fire to Moloch*, *Jer.* 32.45. and so no way intended to the *true God*.

9. And whereas he saith this was *interpreted no better then sacrificing to devils*, *Psal.* 106.37. tis strange he should not see or acknowledge that it was a *downright sacrificing* to *Moloch*, a *Demon*, and not as to the *true God*, but then he could have had no pretense to make it an *act* of *uncommanded worship*, and so such a kind of *Superstition* as is chargeable on our *Christmas Festival*; and then he had lost all the *advantage* which this instance was to bring in to him.

10. Toward this he thought to reap some *benefit* by that *text* of *Scripture*, *He commanded it not, neither came it into his heart, as he somewhere sayes*] But why did he not tell us where *God* saith this? If his *memory* had failed, his *Concordance* would soon have helpt him to set down the *place*. But it was not for his turn it should be examined. The place is *Jer.* 32.35. and again *Jer.* 7.31. and truely, belongs to these *sacrifices* to *Moloch*, but then

God's

God's not commanding &c. ſignifies not onely *uncommanded worſhip*, but by the *figure μείωσις*, ordinary in the *Scripture*, *worſhip directly forbidden*, under threat of *excision*, *Lev.* 20. 2. *Whoſoever he be that giveth any of his ſeed to* Moloch, *he ſhall ſurely be put to death, the people of the land ſhall ſtone him with ſtones, and I will ſet my face againſt him, and cut him off from among his people.* v. 3. *And if the people of the land do any way hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his ſeed to* Moloch, *and kill him not, then will I ſet my face againſt that man and family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him,* v. 4. and accordingly we ſee it in the *Execution*, *Jer.* 7. 31, 32. *The valley of Tophet where they burnt their ſonnes and daughters in the fire, ſhall be called the vally of ſlaughter, for they ſhall bury in Tophet till there be no place.*

11. And ſure this was not the manner of proceeding againſt thoſe that obſerved any *feaſt* or *ſacrifice* to the *true God*, which was not *commanded* or *preſcribed* by *God*, they that kept the *Encænia* were not thus *judged*, and therefore this was very little to the *Diatribiſt's advantage*, as now appears by examining the place; it is pity Mr. *C.* would not *conſider* it.

12. Laſtly, For the words in the *Etymologiſt*, which he ſaith are *fully his ſenſe*, tis again a miſtake, they are directly the contrary, Ἴσιον ὅτι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἕλλησι &c. *It muſt be known that the word Superſtition is among the Græcians* (or *Gentiles*) *taken* ὀνομαστὶ καλῶς *for a good thing, but among us Chriſtians* ὀνομαστὶ τὴν ἀσέβειαν *for impiety.* i. e. evidently the *heathens* and the *Chriſtians* uſe it for the ſame thing, the *worſhip* of *damons*, but that the *Gentiles* commend and account *good*, who uſe it, but we *Chriſtians* juſtly deem it the greateſt *impiety*.

13. Agreeable hereto again is that of *Phavorinus* a *Chriſtian* alſo. Δεισιδαιμονία τὸ πάντα σέβειν καὶ μὲν σεβάσμια, *Superſtition is the worſhipping all things, even thoſe which are not to be worſhipt*, and that δεισιδαίμων ſignifies ἀμφίβολος περὶ τινὸς πίστιν, ἢ καὶ ὁ δεδιὼς τοὺς δαίμονας, *one that is dubious concerning faith* (as the *Iſraelites* betwixt *God* and *Baal*,) or as *Tertullian* ſaith, *if there were conceived more Gods then one, cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur, he ſhould not know whom to worſhip, whether one onely or both*, (*adv: Marc. l.* 1. *c.* 5.) *or he alſo that fears* (or *worſhips*) *damons*,

as the *Aſſyrians* in *Samaria* that *feared the Lord and ſerved their own Gods*. And ſo ſtill this is as *contrary* to the *Diatribiſts* pretenſions as might be. And ſo much for that *Section*.

Sect. 8.

Superſtition always ill, but not always exceſs. Probations from the uſe of words among heathens. The Quare of Divorce vindicated. Superſtitions not reprocht in the Romans by Polybius. *Ignorance not preſently Superſtition.* Ἀγνοοῦντες δ' εὐσεβεῖτε, *Act.* 17. The *Iſraelites worſhipping the Calfe.* Δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωῶ. *Superſtitioſus noting exceſs.*

Numb. 1. THe 22d. §. makes a leap from the 14th to the 27th over 12. not very *brief Sections*, I ſuppoſe it is becauſe he hath no leaſt *objection* to make againſt them (being not elſe very ſparing in this kind) and yet in them is contained my *enumeration* of all the *notions*, wherein the word *Superſtition* is or can be taken in the *antient heathens*, *Scriptures*, and *Chriſtian gloſſaries*, and the *premiſes* on which the ſubſequent *concluſions* are founded, and cannot be *denyed* while the *premiſſes* are *granted*, and the whole matter made clear, that none of the notions of the word is applicable to the benefit of the *Diatribiſt's* pretenſions.

2. Now in §. 27. it ſeems ſome flawes are to be found, as 1. When I ſay tis inconſequent that *Superſtition ſimply and abſolutely taken ſhould be reſolved in all Authors to ſignifie ſomewhat that is ill, particularly falſe worſhip, this*, ſaith he, *is not the queſtion, but whether in Scripture and orthodox Divines it do not always ſignifie ſomething evill, particularly exceſſive and falſe worſhip*. To this the anſwer is eaſie, that I am far from doubting that *Superſtition* is an *ill* thing, and therefore never meant to make that the *queſtion*, This appears of me, becauſe I every where acknowledge the word, *Greek* and *Latine*, to ſignifie the *worſhip* of *demons* or *falſe Gods*, onely I could not but obſerve in the firſt place that the *heathens* who are known to *worſhip* ſuch *demons*, and not to think that a *fault* in themſelves, did mean no

new

new ill by that word (whether *exceſs* or other the like) either more or worſe then they ordinarily meant by *Religion*, this being indeed their *Religion* to *worſhip many Gods*.

3. This they muſt have done, if they had by that word underſtood an *exceſs* of *Religion*, and by their taking it in a *good* ſenſe, as *Synonymous* with *Religion*, it appears that this of *exceſs* was not eſteemed the due *notion* of it.

4. This I thought uſefull to be ſaid, that the very title of *Superſtition* might not defame every thing as an *exceſs* in *Religion*, and *criminous*, to which it was affixt, unleſs it might otherwiſe appear that there was really any ſuch *evill* in it, and this I ſaid πρὸς ἔνδειξιν (to ſhew the *abſurdneſs* of their concluding, who taking the word *Superſtition* for a word of an *univerſal ill ſavour*, as ſignifying *exceſs* of *Religion*, firſt affixe it to *innocent ceremonies* and *inſtitutions*, to which it no way belongs, and then infer them *nocent*, as being *Superſtitious*, without proving any charge of *malignity* againſt them) and as *preparative* to the diſcovery of the following *miſtakes*, rather then that I ever imagined *Superſtition* truely ſo called to have no *ill* in it.

5. And therefore of this, any otherwiſe, then as I now ſay, and then meant, I ſhall make no *queſtion*, and on condition he will never apply the word *Superſtition* any otherwiſe, then the *Scripture* and *antient Chriſtian writers* apply it (i. e. to *damon worſhip*, or to *undue worſhip* of the *true God*, in the notion of *indebitus* or *illegitimus cultus* in *Aquinas*, not to each ſuch *Super ſtatutum* as he will call an *exceſs*, the uſing of each *uncommanded ceremonie* and the like) I ſhall acknowledge the word always to ſignifie that, among all *good writers*, *heathen* or *Chriſtian*, which we *Chriſtians* juſtly deem *evil*, and that was clearly the *Etymologiſt's* meaning, as we ſhewed in the laſt *Sect.* and againſt that there is no colour of *argument* offered in all this long *Sect.*

6. For what if the *vulgar tranſlation* (which he ſets as the *onely* inſtance of *Popiſh Commentators*) render δεισιδαιμονία by *Superſtitio*? what if the *Papiſts* pretend it not to be taken in a good ſenſe (whom I ſuppoſe far enough from yielding themſelves to be *Superſtitious*) doth that prove that *Feſtus* meant any *exceſs* by that word, or indeed any more then *Religion*?

7. Next when he makes his *obſervation*, that in all my *large*

diſcourſe

discourse I bring onely heathens to shew the meaning of the word, and not one Divine, Greek or Latine Father, &c. who take it in a good sense] this is neither true in the *affirmation*, for I bring the *Scripture* and the *Christian glossaries* to *testifie* all that I pretend to, nor yet in the *application*, for I do not pretend the word to signifie that which a *Christian* counts *good*, but among the *heathen* the *worship* of *many Gods*, which none but *heathens* can think to have no *ill* in it, and consequently I pretend it onely of them, and of those that set down the use of words among them, and of S. *Paul* when he is not a finding that *fault* in them, *Act.* 17. 22. and so still this is sufficient to prove that the word *originally* signifies not any *excess* of *Religion* or any other *evil*, abstracted from that of the *Dæmon worship &c.* which was all that I had in design to conclude.

8. And in making this use of *heathen* Authors, sure I have done nothing which I ever blamed in any man else, as the *Diatribist's margent* accuseth me, citing the *Quære* of *Divorce*, §. 58. where I thought it unreasonable that all the *antient Christian writers* should not be as competent to give us the signification of δεισιδαιμονία as *Demosthenes* and *Philo* (and yet made no *scruple* to acquiesce in the *notion*, which either *Demosthenes* or *Philo* gave us, §. 57.)

9. For if he pleased to mark, there is here no *difference* between the *heathen* writers and others, *Scripture* and *antient Christians*, concerning the meaning of the word *Superstition*, all yeelding it *equally* to signifie the *worship* of *many Gods* (whereas there that other person whom I *opposed*, profest a *contrariety*, and then preferred the one before the other) To which yet it is necessarily *consequent*, that in another inquiry, whether *Superstition* were among *Authors* taken in a *good* sense, some difference should be observed between *Authors heathen* and *Christian*, because it is certain the *heathen worship* is by us *Christians* most justly lookt on as an *ill* thing, being the *worship* of *creatures*, but by the *heathens* thought *well* of, as the *Diatribist* here confesseth, *practised* and *commended*, and so not lookt on any otherwise then *Religion* it self, ὃπερ καλῶς λεγόμενον, in the *Etymologist*, *used for a good* thing; consequently, the thing which I contest, is not this, that the *worship* of *dæmons* is or ever was *true* or *lawfull*, but that beside this, supposed by *Christians* but denyed by *heathens*, to be *evill* (adding the

the like of *illegitimate worſhip*) there is nothing elſe which hath been lookt on as *ſimply* bad in *Superſtition*, particularly not the *exceſs*, as that ſignifies *unpreſcribed uncommanded worſhip*, which is the onely matter of the preſent *conteſt* with ſuch as the *Diatribiſt*.

10. And he doth but *perplex* and *diſturbe* the matter when he ſaith the *queſtion* is, whether it doth not always in *Scripture* and *Orthodox Divines* ſignifie *exceſſive* and *falſe worſhip*, for he muſt ſet the *queſtion*, as elſewhere he doth, of *exceſſive*, as that ſignifies no more then *uncommanded* worſhip, without the addition of being *falſe*, it being evident that I defend not *falſe worſhip* of any kind to be *good*, but that *ceremonies* or *inſtitutions not commanded* by *God* may yet be perfectly *lawfull* and *blameleſs*, and that that is the onely *queſtion* between us.

11. For the *text* of the *Act. c.* 25. 19. I have anſwered already, and evidenced that *Feſtus* meant nothing *ill* by *Superſtition*; and the *Drs.* words cited from *Sect.* 24. of the *ordinary practiſe of every Sect to diſlike the diſtant worſhip of others, and defame it under the title of Religion*, doth no way prejudge this; becauſe it is certain *Feſtus* was no way *factious* for the *Jewes* againſt *Pauls Religion*; No more doth the *marginal* citation from §. 22. where I have ſaid that *Superſtition* was made matter of *reproach* to the *Romans*; where 1. It was not *Superſtition* ſimply, but the μὴ καλλιστῆν ὑπερβολὴν, *not coming ſhort of exceſs*, of which that was ſaid that it was παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὀνειδιζόμενον, *reproached by others*, and yet as much *commended* by the *Author Polybius* in that place, and 2. That the *old rule* in *Logick* will always hold, there is no *ſyllogizing* from *particulars*, nor can this ever be formed into a *regular ſyllogiſme* or *valid* probation, ſome there were that *reproacht* the *Romans Superſtition*, therefore *Feſtus reproacht Paul's Act.* 25. 19. or ſpake of it by way of *defamation*.

12. What remains of this *Sect.* belongs to the place *Act.* 17. 23. of which I had ſaid, 1. That *the Apoſtle ſpeaking of thoſe whom he cals* δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, *more Superſtitious then other men, tels them that they did* ἀγνοοῦντες *worſhip the true God though ignorantly*, 2. *That he ſtyles them more religious then other men, meerly in relation to their worſhipping the unknown (which was the true)*

God, which others worshipt not, and so meant no more by that phrase then that they were more religious then other men, no way appearing to accuse them of that as of their fault, but preparing thereby to declare to them that true God whom they worshipt ignorantly.

13. To this many things are here *objected*, 1. That their *worshipping the true God ignorantly with their own devised worship, was a Superstition justly to be condemned, It being gross Idolatry and sinful Superstition in the Israelites to worship the true God in the golden Calfe.*]

14. I answer, their *ignorance* of the *true God* was justly to be condemned, according to that of *Minutius Felix*, *Non minoris est sceleris Deum ignorare quàm lædere, it is as great wickedness to be ignorant of God as to hurt him*, or that of *Trismegistus* (as I remember) ἄγνοια μανίας εἶδος, *Ignorance of God is a species of madness*, and in another of the *antients* style, τὶς μέθη a kind of *drunkenness* of the *soul*; But that being granted, 1. This *ignorance* was not the thing that *denominated* them *Superstitious*, but their *worshipping many Gods*, 2. Their *worshipping* the *true God*, though they *knew him not*, was no *new species* of *Superstition*, wherein they *exceeded* others, 3. Their *worshipping* him with their *own devised worship* was not it which is meant by their *worshipping* him *ignorantly*, the words in the *original* are ὃν ἀγνοοῦντες εὐσεβεῖτε, literally *whom ye not knowing*, or being *ignorant* of him, *worship*, i. e. *worship* him whilest ye *know him not*, which no way refers to the *manner* of their *worship*, as *devised by themselves*, but onely to their *ignorance* of the *God* whom they thus *worshipt*, which therefore the *Apostle* applies himself to cure, and accordingly it follows, *him declare I unto you.*

15. Lastly, their *worshipping* him as *dwelling in Temples made with hands*, i. e. in little *Chaplets* or *Shrines* or *Images* &c. v. 24. is not their *Superstition* but *Idol-worship*, and is very much more then the *uncommanded ceremonies* will amount to, and so cannot be a proper instance of their *own devised worship*, in the *Diatribists* notion of the phrase for all *uncommanded worship*; and sure the *Israelites woshipping* the *true God* in a *golden Calf*, is as little pertinent to that business, for if it be true, that they *worshipt* none but the *true God*, then was that only *Idolatry* against the 2^d^ *Commandment*,

mandment, not *Superſtition* or *demon worſhip* againſt the *firſt*, or if they *worſhipt* the *Gods* of the *Ægyptians*, or any one of them, *Apis* in that *figure*, then what was that to the *worſhipping* of the *true God* in an *ignorant*, or by *themſelves deviſed manner*?

15. 2dly. He ſaith my rendring the place *more religious* then *other* men, *in relation to their worſhipping the unknown God, which others worſhipt not, is my gloſs, begges the queſtion, is againſt the text it ſelf, I perceive that in all things yee are too Superſtitious, both in their worſhipping many falſe Gods, and in their ignorant worſhip of the true, and in their vitious rites of worſhip*, adding that *this ſenſe the Dr. himſelf gave* §. 11. *I conſider and behold you in all things* (or *in all that I ſee of you*) *as men more Superſtitious then others.*

16. Here I perceive my words are *miſtaken*, and therefore ſhall firſt anſwer to that, then to the former parts of the *objection*. The *Greek* is καὶ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, literally, *in all things*, or *in all reſpects, I look upon you as more Superſtitious*, i. e. (I take it, and I thought I had ſufficiently expreſt it before) *conſidering all the altars and inſcriptions*, i. e. the *names* of your *deities*, which I ſee or behold, I conclude that you are *more Superſtitious* or *religious*, *worſhip more Gods* or *demons*, then other men.

17. That this is the ſenſe, I am inclined to believe by the *reaſon* of his ſpeech rendred in the *next*, διερχόμενος γὰρ &c. *for paſſing through and contemplating your worſhips*, i. e. the *Gods* which you *worſhip*, *I found alſo an altar on which was inſcribed To the unknown God*. The ſumme of which is, that in the ſurvey of their *altars*, which contained the *names* of their *Gods*, he found one *altar* remarkably more, then is uſuall among *other* people, that *to the unknown God*, the *true God* of *heaven*, which others in their πολυθεότης or *worſhip* of *many Gods* did not *worſhip*, which being the *proof* or *reaſon* (expreſt by the γὰρ *for*) of the former ſpeech, muſt needs give me authority to interpret it in *proportion* thereto, that *conſidering* all that he had *ſeen* of them, peculiarly that *altar* to the *unknown God*, he concluded them *more Superſtitious*, i. e. *worſhippers* of *more Gods* then *other* folkes.

18. That the *Athenians* truely were ſo eſteemed, appears evidently by what was ſaid in the Tr: of *Superſtition* § 11. and hath here formerly been added to that head, and therefore that will very

fitly be the notion of the word, not *too Superſtitious*, but literally *more Superſtitious* then others, eſpecially if it be remembred that the bare addition of the *worſhip* of the *true God* (however *unknown* to them) to their other δεισιδαιμονία or *worſhip* of *many Gods*, cannot be a *new fault* in them, diſtinct from the other, or a *ſuperaddition* to the guilts of *other* men.

19. All which being conſidered, it now appears, 1. How far from truth it is which is here ſuggeſted, that *Pauls* ſpeech of δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς (however rendred) *belongs both to their worſhipping ſo many falſe Gods, and to their ignorant worſhip of the true, and to their vitious rites of worſhip*, when it clearly belongs but to *one*, their *worſhipping* the *unknown God*, which others *worſhipt* not. 2. How far my words §. 11. were miſtaken or perverted by him, 3. How far my *interpretation* hath been from oppoſing the *text* it ſelf, being the clear importance of the *text* conſidered with S. *Pauls reaſon*, as the *key* by which to enter into the *true* meaning of it; and laſtly how far this is from any *begging* the *queſtion*, when I *proved* ſo largely whatſoever I ſaid, and when no *anſwer* is here offered to thoſe *proofs*, and yet, if there were any need, here have been added farther convincing *confirmations* of the ſame thing, if yet they may deſerve to be taken notice of.

20. And this is all that is in the leaſt degree needfull to be ſaid to this §. 22. unleſs I yet adde that thoſe words in the cloſe of it, cited from me, that §. 31. *Superſtitioſus in the poſitive ſignifies exceſs more then in the comparative*, are not very intelligible, which they would ſurely have been, to me at leaſt, if they had rightly reported my *ſenſe*.

21. That which I ſaid is no more then this, that *Superſtitioſus* by force of the *termination oſus*, may ſignifie an *exceſs*, and that ſo *Religioſus* may alſo; but what is that to the uſe of the word, whether in the *poſitive* or the *comparative*, when it is the bare rendring of the *Greek* δεισιδαίμων, as here it is, which no way ſignifies thus?

Sect. 9.

Sect. 9.

The Diatribiſt's conceſſion of the innocence of unpreſcribed ceremonies, and ſo of all that is demanded. His cenſure of himſelf and Chamier. Authority in a Church to inſtitute Ceremonies. Abſtaining from ceremonies, becauſe commanded by men or abuſed by Papiſts.

THe next or 23d, §. is very brief, but yet ſeems to me to be very *conſiderable*, and that in ſuch a degree that it might well make an end of this *debate* betwixt the *Diatribiſt* and me, for having exactly ſet down a 2d. *inconſequence* (by me *noted* and *concluded* to be ſuch, from the opening of the *Greek* and *Latine* words) viz. that *the uſe of ceremonies or rites in the worſhip of God, if not diſtinctly preſcribed by the example or precept of Chriſt, ſhould be called Superſtition, and for that condemned*] he anſwers no more but this. [*I believe this is a miſtake, none that I know make ſuch a conſequence, but rather thus, that what rite or ceremonie ſoever is made a part of worſhip, without ſuch example or precept of Scripture, is Superſtitious and therefore condemned.*

2. I ſhall not here indevour to perſwade the *Diatribiſt* that he *knows* ſome who *condemne uncommanded rites* as *Superſtitious*, becauſe *Superſtatutum*, ſuch as *kneeling* at the *Euchariſt*, uſing the *croſs* in *baptiſme*, *bowing* at the *name* of *Jeſus*, but taking him at his word, I beſeech him to tell me, why then he undertook the *confutation* of the *Tr.* of *Superſtition*, which, he muſt know, contended no more then this, being deſigned to this *onely* end, the averting that *envy* and *calumnie*, that was then frequently but unjuſtly caſt upon our *Church*, upon the account of *ceremonies*, and which was ſince in the *Tract* of *Feſtivals*, no farther applied, then as that *analogie* would juſtly bear, which was betwixt *uncommanded rites* and *uncommanded days* of *worſhip*, betwixt *unpreſcribed geſtures*, and *times*, both which are known to be but *circumſtances* and *acceſſories*, no *eſſentiall* parts or *branches* of *worſhip*.

3. This truely were very ſtrange for him to be *ignorant* of; As it is, 'tis the *yielding* me the whole cauſe, and I have no more to *contend* for, but onely *peace*, and what by *perfect analogie* from one *circumſtance* of *worſhip* to another, will irrefragably be concluded from that which is here *granted* by him.

4. Tis now pity that we that are thus ſuddenly *pieced*, ſhould ever *fall* out again; Nay we are likely, if words may be *believed*, to be yet more *firmly knit* together and *conſolidated*, for § 24. in anſwer to the 3d. *inconſequence* noted by me [*that men on pretence and in the name of piety ſhould abſtain from ſome obſervances (indifferent) as Superſtitious, either becauſe commanded by lawfull authority or abuſed by Papiſts*] he ſpeaks clearly that it is a *worſe miſtake*, and that he *believes I cannot give an inſtance of one underſtanding Chriſtian, that ever did abſtain from obſervances indifferent, becauſe commanded by lawfull authority, but rather that they were thought not indifferent, but obtruded on them as parts of worſhip, and ſo likewiſe for the other, that they have been uſed by Papiſts, is not all, but that by them they have been abuſed and counted parts of worſhip, and may eaſily return to be ſo accounted by others.*

5. But to this I muſt reply, leſt by *ſilence* I incur the guilt of *ſcandal* of having *wronged* others, and of writing all that hath been written on this Theme, without any *adverſary* to provoke me to it. Firſt then, I profeſſe to be able to give inſtance of *many*, that were *baptized* into our *common faith*, and ſo were *Chriſtians* (how deeply *underſtanding* I pretend not to judge) who have abſtained from the *uſe* of *ceremonies* meerly upon this *ſcore*, becauſe commanded by their *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*, the *King* and *Biſhops*, by *Canon Eccleſiaſtical*; This, ſaid they, was laying more *burthens* on them then *God* had laid, and ſo uſurping on their *Chriſtian liberty*. And in ſtead of naming thoſe men, without their conſent, for that muſt now be the *vilifying* them, the involving them under the *Diatribiſts cenſure*, that they are not *underſtanding Chriſtians*, I ſhall name one on whom he may paſs what judgement he ſhall pleaſe, having full power to do it, this very *Diatribiſt* himſelf, *p.* 31. where 1. He hath theſe words, *If men may be Judges what are fit for number and wholeſomeneſs, every after comer will think himſelf as wiſe as he that went*

went before, till they have loaded the Chriſtian above the few.
2. That the *learned Chamier hath well obſerved, that there may be many miſchiefs in a few ceremonies, if the authority to inſtitute them be in the Church or any man or men.*

6. The *former* of theſe ſpeeches is pretty home to the point in hand, for if the *objection* to the *number* or *wholeſomneſs* of *ceremonies* be this, that *men* are *judges* of them, as they always are when *men command* them, then ſure it is the *power* of the *lawful magiſtrate* (for he is a *man* or *men*) to *command*, which is the *ground* of the *quarrel*, and they that quarrel thus, and abſtain from *indifferent ceremonies* upon this ſcore, muſt *abſtain* becauſe *commanded* by *lawfull authority*. As for example, I ſuppoſe *bowing* when *Jeſus* is *named* in the *publike worſhip* (or when *Chriſt*, or when the *Holy Ghoſt*) to be in it ſelf *lawfull* or *indifferent*, becauſe no where *forbidden* by *God*, I ſuppoſe farther, that being ſo, *this* and a *few* other ſuch *ceremonies* may very ſafely be uſed by a *Chriſtian*, though they were not *commanded*; I now demand, may a *few*, namely, *three* or *four* ſuch *ceremonies* be lawfully *preſcribed* or *commanded* by the *Supreme power* in any *Church* to all under that authority? And may all under that *authority* ſafely *obſerve* ſuch *ceremonies* ſo *commanded*? If they may, then *men* may be *judges* what *ceremonies* are fit both for *number* and *wholeſomeneſs*, which is contrary to the direct words of the *Diatribiſt*, in the former part of this *ſpeech*, If they may not, then it ſeems what was before *lawfull* and *indifferent* is now ſince it was *commanded*, and by no other *change*, become *unlawfull*, which was the *inconſequence* I pointed at, and it ſeems miſtook not in thinking ſome body (it now ſeems this *Diatribiſt*) to be the very perſon *guilty* of it.

7. But then the *latter* ſpeech is as punctuall to it as could be well imagined (and if the *Diatribiſt* have cited duely, *Chamier* and he are both of this *opinion*) For it being certain that nothing can be *commanded* by *lawful authority*, unleſs the *authority* of *inſtituting* it be either in the *Church* or *man* or *men*, it muſt neceſſarily follow upon the aſſerting of the many *miſchiefs* in a *few ceremonies*, if the *authority* to inſtitute them be in the *Church* or *man* or *men*, that there muſt be *many miſchiefs* in their being *commanded* by *lawfull authority*, & then no *underſtanding Chriſtian* can think it fit for him

by,

by *obſerving* ſuch *commands* to be *acceſſory* to or guilty of the *introducing* thoſe *miſchiefs*, & ſo muſt *abſtain* on that one account of the *Churches* exerciſing ſuch an *authority*, which was the very thing I deemed, and noted to be ſo *inconſequent*.

8. Nay the very words of the *Diatribiſt* in this place, when he charges me of *miſtake*, being theſe [*that they that abſtain from indifferent obſervances, do it becauſe they were thought not indifferent, but obtruded on them as parts of worſhip*] are either a *calumnie* againſt the *Governors* of our *Church*, or elſe they aſſert what he diſclaimes ſo ſolemnly.

9. For I ſhall demand, Is his meaning this, that the *Governors* of the *Church* thought the *ceremonies* ſimply *neceſſary* and not *indifferent*, *antecedently to the command of the Church*, i. e. *neceſſary* by the *Divine Law*, though the *Church* had never *commanded* them? If that be his meaning (as ſeems moſt probable by what follows [*obtruded on them as parts of worſhip*] for all *parts* of *worſhip* are *neceſſary* by *divine Law*, though never *commanded* by *man*) then this is a direct *calumnie* againſt the *Governors* of the *Church*, who never thought all *ceremonies* to be *preſcribed* by *God's Law*, and therefore *preſcribed* them by *Canon Eccleſiaſtical*, which argues that they eſteemed them not as *Divine* but *Humane Laws*, never *obtruded* them as *parts* of *worſhip*, but as *ceremonies* for *uniformity* and *decency*, and as uſefull toward *aſſiſting*, *inciting*, and *expreſſing* of *piety* outwardly.

10. But if his meaning be, that being in themſelves *indifferent*, they became *neceſſary* and not *indifferent* by the *intervening* of the *Churches command*, and ſo were *obtruded* on men as *parts* of *worſhip* (as that may poſſibly ſignifie with him *parts* of *obedience* or *duty* to *God* by *virtue* of his *command* to *obey* our *Superiors*) and if this were the thing *diſliked* in the *ceremonies* preſcribed by the *Church*, then again tis evident that their being *commanded* by *lawfull authority*, is the onely *objection* to them and *ground* of *abſtaining* from them, in the judgement of his *Diatribiſt*, at the very point of time, when he ſo ſolemnely diſclaimes it.

11. So likewiſe may be ſaid to his account of thoſe things which are *abſtained* from becauſe they have been uſed by *Papiſts*, *This*, ſaith he, *is becauſe they have been by them abuſed and counted*

parts

parts of worſhip. But truly I cannot with truth thus affirme of the *Papiſts*, that any of the *ceremonies* which we uſe from them, were ever by them accounted *parts* of *worſhip*, but onely as *uſefull wholeſome ceremonies* appointed by the *Church.*

12. Of the *difference* between *parts* of *worſhip* and *circumſtances* of *time*, *place*, *geſture*, *acceſſaries*, of *worſhip*, I have ſpoken at large, c. 2. §. 3. And though hereafter §. 28. this *difference* be fully conſented to by the *Diatribiſt* in theſe words [*ſome rites and ceremonies of worſhip are rather called circumſtances of worſhip, time, place, geſture, which are common adjuncts of Religions and Civil affaires, then properly Religious, much leſs to be accounted parts of worſhip*] yet by what hath here been ſaid by him, it appears that all his skill lyes in managing that one *fallacie*, putting all *ceremonies* and *inſtitutions* of the *Church* under that one *ambiguous* phraſe *uncommanded worſhip*, perſwading himſelf or others that we introduce *new parts* of *worſhip*, and ſo do contrary to *God's command*, who hath ſet down the *rule* of *worſhip*, i. e. preſcribed all the *parts* and *ſpecies* of *worſhip*, whereas he cannot but know that all that we ſay in aſſerting whether of *ceremonies* or *Feſtivals*, is no more but this, that each of theſe, not as *parts* of *worſhip*, but as *decent attendants* of it, though not *inſtituted* by *God*, have yet been *lawfully* and *orderly* appointed and obſerved by the *Church* of *God* in generall, and are to us become matter of *obligation*, by that means, and as *preſcribed* by the *Governors* of our *particular Church*, to which our *obedience* is due, and ſo that there is no degree of *Superſtition* in us in doing that which is thus *required* of us, nor in thoſe that *require* it in laying this *obligation* upon us.

13. And ſo much for his *animadverſions* on the *three inconſequences*, from which if he would really and in earneſt clear himſelf, theſe *debates* were *certainly concluded.*

Sect. 10.

Strictures on some particulars in the remaining Sections. What excess Divines mean by Superstition. What St Augustine. Obligation to performance, without being parts of worship. Observers of order more Religious more acceptable then others. The reason why Jewish ceremonies are interdicted. The Church of England sparing in ceremonies. Ceremonies not foreshewing Christ lawful to be retained by Christians. The abstinence from blood, long continued in the Church. The Saterday Sabbath. Negative wholesomness not sufficient to recommend ceremonies. All folly in worship is not Superstition. The opinion of the antient Church worth considering. No duties appointed for the circumstances sake. Time or place instituted by God is a circumstance, as well as when by man. Apostolical Divine.

Numb. 1. THat which follows §. 25. &c. is for the most part but *revolving* the same things again that have hitherto been spoken to, or the hiding himself in those *obscurities* which have now been explained, sometimes *granting* all that I assert, sometimes *denying* it in *ambiguous phrases*, as that all *excess* in *worship* not *prescribed* is a *nimiety* and *culpable* §. 25. that *rites* be they never so *few*, if introduced as *parts* of *worship*, are *Superstitious* v. 28. and the like. And the Reader must not be condemned to the *penance*, of having all that hath been said on these heads, *repeated* again, and therefore I am both in *justice* and *charity* obliged to omit particular replies κατ' ἐξοχὴν to the remaining *Sections*, yet shall read them over as carefully as I can, and observe whatever I discern may be thought *pertinent* to his *cause*, which hath not hitherto been spoken to.

2 As 1. When he saith §. 26. that *all Divines generally condemne it*, I answer, they *condemne Superstition*, but mean not by it every *excess* in *worship* not *prescribed*, as that phrase comprehends all *ceremonies* and *festivals* not *commanded* by *God*; and those *Divines* that *condemne* this under the name of *Superstition*, are the men of whom onely my words are to be *understood*, that they are so *few* and so *modern*, *and of so small authority*, *that* they

they were ſcarce worth producing, no *antient* writer having ever *condemned* all *ceremonies* and *feſtivals*, which are not *commanded* by *God*, under the title of *Superſtition*; and that * *Aquinas's* words are no way appliable to it, hath been already ſhewed. * 2. 2. *qu.* 93. *art.* 1.

3. As for St *Auguſtines* place produced by me §. 33. from whence he collects that an *inſtitution* of *worſhip* by *men* may be *Superſtitious*, I anſwer, that that Father ſpeaks there of thoſe *qui inſtituerunt Deorum ſimulachra, who inſtituted images of Gods*, which the *Diatribiſt* could not but ſee, if he had pleaſed, and of ſuch *inſtitutions* I grant that they not onely may be, but are *Superſtitious*, but our *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are no *Deorum Simulachra, images of the Gods*, and ſo ſure not lyable to his *cenſure*.

4. 2dly. When §. 29. he affirmes of *uſages in themſelves lawfull and allowable*, that *if they were taught or practiſed as neceſſary, or as making the obſervers more Religious then others, or more acceptable to God, then they would be parts of worſhip*] (and then I muſt ſuppoſe by his tenure of *doctrine, Superſtitious*) I anſwer, 1. That *decency*, or *uniformity*, or *obedience* to *Superiors* may be a *competent* ground to turn *lawfull* ceremonies into *neceſſary*, and on thoſe grounds joyned together, I may *kneel* and *teach kneeling* at the taking of the *Euchariſt* to be *neceſſary*, viz. not by any *neceſſity* of *divine precept* terminated *immediately* in this *geſture*, but by ſuch *neceſſity* as *Humane Laws*, by force of the *fift Commandment*, and τοῖς ἡγουμένοις, *obey thoſe that are placed over you*, lay upon me, and this is far from making this *kneeling* a *part* of *worſhip*, when we know it is but a *geſture*, and *circumſtance* of it. 2. That they which *pray reverently* and *decently*, obſerve *uniformity*, *obey* the *lawfull commands* of the *Church*, are in ſo doing *more Religious* and more *acceptable* to *God* then others, who *cæteris paribus*, do it not, *pray irreverently*, act *undecently*, obſerve not *uniformity*, diſobey the *lawfull commands* of their *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*, or then they which perform the *ſame* things upon their own *choices*. So ſaith *Leo de jejun: 7. menſ: Serm: 3. Divinarum namque reverentia Sanctionum inter qualibit ſpontanea obſervantiæ ſtudia habet ſemper privilegium ſuum, ut ſacratius ſit quod publica lege celebratur, quam quod privatâ inſtitutione deputatur. The reverence of the Divine*, i.e.

Eccleſiaſtical ſanctions have always this privilege among ſpontaneous obſervances, that whatſoever is performed by publick law, is more ſacred, then what is done upon private inſtitution. This I hope I ſhall not need farther to prove, and if not, then ſure the *teaching* this or *acting* on theſe grounds, will not make my *allowable action criminous* or *Superſtitious*.

5. 3dly. When §. 31. he finds fault with men for ſaying that the *ſole reaſon why old Jewiſh ceremonies are interdicted us Chriſtians, is, becauſe the obſerving thoſe which foreſhewed Chriſt, and teaching the neceſſity of them, would be the denying Chriſt to be come*, paralleling this with an *anſwer* of *Bellarmine's* and readring an account from *Chamier*, that there was *another reaſon* of their *abrogation, becauſe they did load the conſcience with a yoke of a multitude of ceremonies, and that this is common to thoſe, and to the traditions of men*] I anſwer, 1. That it is one thing for *Jewiſh ceremonies* to be *interdicted Chriſtians*, another for them not to be *impoſed*, the *weight* of the *yoke* was the reaſon why they were not to be *impoſed*, and to that the *Diatribiſts reaſons* in the concluſion of §. 31. do *all* belong; but my ſpeech was evidenly of their being *interdicted*, and that meant not onely of the *multitude* of them, but of *every* or *each* of them, and the ſole *reaſon* of that, was this which I aſſigned, for if the *weight* of the *multitude* were at all *conſidered* in that, then any *one* of them, which ſure was not a *multitude*, would have been *lawful*, by name *circumciſion*, or *ſacrificing*, or the like, againſt which yet the *Chriſtian* interdict lyes, as well as againſt the whole *number*.

6. 2dly. Tis certain that in the *application* of this inſtance to *ceremonies* (not *preſcribed* by *God* in a *Chriſtian Church*) there is great *difference* betwixt the *Church* of which *Bellarmine* was an *advocate*, and that which I undertook to *defend*. In the *Church* of *Rome* there is a great *multitude* of *ceremonies* and *feſtivals*, which may be capable of the title of *weight* and *yoke*, but the *Church* of *England* is far more *ſparing*, and I had fully conſented to the rule of *pauca & ſalubres, few and ſalubrious*, and was now diſputing for the *lawfulneſs* of *ſome ceremonies*, *uncommanded* by *God*, not for the *expedience* of neer *ſo many*, as other *Chriſtians* both of the *Weſtern* and *Eaſtern Churches* have received into their *Canons*, and proportionable to that was any *one*, or never

ſo

ſo *few old Jewiſh ceremonies*, for the *abrogation* of which I was therefore obliged to give ſuch an account, as was not founded in the multitude of them, and conſequently could not take either *Chamier's* or the *Diatribiſt's* adviſe, to render any other then what I rendred, as I thought, from ſuch like plain words of the *Apoſtle*, *We have an altar, of which they have not power to eat, that ſerve the tabernacle*, Heb. 13.

7. In this matter the *Diatribiſt* asks a *ſubtle queſtion, whether if a Chriſtian had obſerved ſome Jewiſh ceremony, which did not foreſhew Chriſt to come, but ſignificant only of ſomething paſt (though they had not taught it neceſſary) the Apoſtle would not have blamed them for that as ſuperſtitious; and ſo for any new rites and ceremonies?* To which I anſwer confidently, and to the latter firſt, that he would *not*, and the very asking or *queſtioning* it in that *form*, as if it could not be *denied* but the *Apoſtle* would have *blamed* them, is the known *fallacy* of *begging* the *queſtion*: For the whole matter of *controverſy* betwixt me and the *Diatribiſt* is this, whether every *deviſed rite or ceremony* not *commanded* by *God*, be *ſuperſtitious?*

8. And to the *former* part of the *queſtion* I *anſwer* as *confidently*, and ask him *firſt*, what he thinks of the *abſtinence from things ſtrangled*, and all *eating* of *bloud*, was not that a *Jewiſh ceremony?* and was not that obſerved by *Chriſtians Act.* 15. and did the *Apoſtles* blame it as *ſuperſtitious?* Certainly they did not. Nay, did not this *obſervance* continue among *Chriſtians* for *many* ages? *Ne animalium quidem ſanguinem in epulis habemus, ſuffocatis & morticinis abſtinemus, we have not the bloud of any living creatures in our feaſts, we abſtain from things ſtrangled, and that die of themſelves:* ſaith *Tertullian, Apol.* c. 9. And *Lucian* tells us how his *Peregrinus* was rejected by the *Chriſtians*, ὥφθη χθὲς, ὡς οἶμαι, ἐδίων ἀπορρήτων ἀνίοις, *for eating ſome of their forbidden meats*, which ſure belongs to this matter; and in *Euſebius's hiſtory* l. 5. c. 1. *Biblis* thus vindicates the *Chriſtians* from the accuſation of *eating* of *children*, becauſe, ſaith ſhe, μηδὲ ἀλόγων ζώων αἷμα φαγεῖν ἐξὸν, *we count it not lawful to eat the bloud of unreaſonable creatures.* If this be not perfectly home to his *queſtion*, I ſhall then proceed, and alledge for my inſtance the known practice of the *Chriſtian Church* of the *Apoſtles* and *pu-*

reſt time, who as they *celebrated* the *weekly Lords day*, on the *firſt* of the *week*, in *commemoration* of *Chriſts reſurrection*, ſo they continued the *obſervation* of the *Saterday Sabbath* on the *laſt day* of the *week*, in *remembrance* of the *Creation* of the *World*. The cuſtome appears in *Tertullian de Monogam*: and was continued to the time of the *Laodicean Councel*, which orders that not only the *Law*, as *Act.*15.21. but the *Goſpel* alſo ſhould be read that day. And the *words* of *Balſamon* are clear, παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξισώθησαν δι' ὅλου σχεδὸν ταῖς κυριακαῖς τὰ σάββατα, *the Sabbaths were by the holy Fathers almoſt quite equalled to the Lords days*: and a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe, as is elſewhere ſhewed in the *Expoſition* of the fourth *Commandment*.

9. 4thly. When §. 32. he ſo reports my words as to conclude me to affirm, that *if ceremonies be but harmleſs, or negatively wholeſome, there cannot be too much of them*, This is a plain changing of ſenſe into that which is moſt *contrary* to it; For my words are plain, without his *gloſſe*, that *if they be poſitively wholſom or tending to edification* (not *contenting* my ſelf with *negatively wholeſom* or *harmleſſe*, or with any thing leſſe then *poſitive wholſomneſſe*) then there will be *little reaſon to accuſe them of exceſſe*, then they will *rather help devotion then incumber it*, the fear of which was the main *objection* againſt the *multitude* of them.

10. 5thly. When §.35. he pretends to *prove all folly and vanity in the worſhip of God, to be ſuperſtition*, by demanding what *Superſtition* is, but *folly and vanity?*] this is a meer *paralogiſme*, (never reducible into a *Logical mood* and *figure*) by ſuppoſing things to be *convertible* which are *not*, as if I ſhould prove a *particular ſubſtance* (for example, the *ſoul* of man) to be a *body*, becauſe every *body*, is a *ſubſtance*, The anſwer would be eaſie, by ſaying, every *body* is a *ſubſtance*, but every *ſubſtance* is not a *body*, ſo in like manner, *every ſuperſtition* is *folly*, and *vanity*, but every *folly* and *vanity*, even in the *worſhip* of *God*, is not *ſuperſtition*, This was a little too *groſſe* a *Sophiſme* to impoſe it ſelf upon the *Diatribiſt*, and he now ſees a ſmall meaſure of *ſubtility* was ſufficient to *enable* me for the *diſcovering* of it.

11. 6xtly. When §. 34. on occaſion of my ſpeaking of that one *kinde*

kinde of *exceſſe*, of *placing more virtue in ſome things then belongs to them*, he demands what I mean by [*or in the eſtimation of the purer ages of the Church*] and *whether the purer ages of the Church after the Apoſtles had power to put virtue into things which they had not either naturally or by the rule of Gods word?* I anſwer that I never thought of any ſuch thing, that my meaning is *plain* enough, if he would pleaſe to ſee it, in the end of §. 45. *viz.* that the *thing*, there mentioned, the *ſigne* of the *Croſſe* and the *parva Evangelia*, and the like, had *not either naturally or by the rule of Gods word, or in the eſtimation of the purer ages of the Church, that force or virtue in them*, which in the latter *impurer ages* they were thought to have: and I wonder what difficulty there was in *underſtanding*, or fault in *affirming* this, which hath no more *dangerous* intimation, then that the *opinion* or *eſtimation* of the *pureſt* ages of the *Church*, i. e. the *firſt* and neereſt to the *Apoſtles* times, were, in any ſuch controverſie as this, very fit to be conſidered in their due place, *i.e.* next after the *Apoſtles* themſelves.

12. 7^thly. When §. 30. concerning *holyneſſe*, or *ſeparation* to *holy* from *common uſes*, he promiſes to ſpeak *ſomewhat conſiderable*, and under that head tells us that there is this *difference between times and places ſeparated by God, and thoſe which are ſeparated by men, that the former require holy duties to fill them up*, i.e. that the *duties* are *appointed* for the *time* or *places* ſake, *but the latter are to wait upon holy duties, the time or place are appointed for the duties ſake*] I muſt ſtill challenge his *promiſe*, whereby he is yet our *debtor* of *ſomewhat conſiderable*. For certainly *prayer* and *faſting* and *ſacrifices* among the *Jews*, all *duties appointed* by *God* (as in ſtead of the laſt the *offertorie* or *almes* among *Chriſtians*) were not appointed for *time* or *places* ſake; *holy days* and *holy places*, the *weekly Sabbath*, and the *annual* day of *Expiation*, and the *tabernacle* and *Temple* at *Jeruſalem*, were never the *end* for which *prayer*, &c. were *inſtituted*; nor is it imaginable how they ſhould, when each of thoſe *duties*, viſibly *prayer* and *ſacrifice*, were *appointed* and *practiſed* before there was any ſuch thing, as *Tabernacle* or *Temple* inſtituted by *God*.

13. Again, the *time* or *place*, when *inſtituted* by *God* himſelf, is as truly a *circumſtance* of *worſhip* as when *inſtituted* by *men*, and *duty* is equally the *ſubſtance*: and it can with no *probability* be affirmed

affirmed that the *substance* is appointed for the *circumstances* sake, or (as he is pleased to speak) *to till up the circumstances*, any otherwise then he would say *substances* were created to *till up accidents*, the *body* for the *colors* sake.

14. As for his *charge* at the end of §. 39. that I make *difference* betwixt *Apostolical* and *divine institutions*, and therein vary from my *resolution* of the *first Quare*, §. 22. It is soon dispatcht by acknowledging I do not think that the *Apostles* were *God*, and thereupon for *perspicuity* sake I made these several heads of *institutions*, some by *Christ*, some by the *Apostles*, *inspired*, and *commissionated* by *Christ*, the former I called *Divine*, the second *Apostolical*, as that is not *personally* and *immediatly divine*, yet not at all *doubting*, or giving any cause of *doubt*, whether the *latter* were not of *divine original* and *obligation* also, wherein sure I spake after the *example* and *manner* of *men*, and that in order to *distinctnesse* and *perspicuity*, not foreseeing such *cavils* as this, when I thus spake.

15. 8[thly]. What follows of *Wil-worship* in the end of this *Exercitation*, must be reserved to the next *Exercitation*, which is the place designed for it, and for the *Diatribist* to take it here for *granted*, as he doth, that my *voluntary oblation* is an eminent *Species* of *Superstition*, *against which*, *punishment is denounced in the second Commandment*: when he knowes that whole *Tract* of *Wil-worship* undertakes to demonstrate the contrary, what is this but a meer *begging* of the *Question*, and that a prime sort of *fallacious arguing*, the solemn *refuge* of those which are *destitute* of all other?

Sect. II.

A Vindication of the Tract of Superstition from uncharitablenesse.

Numb. 1. THese few things being thus shortly replyed to by way of *Structure*, there remains now no more on this *first head* of *discourse*,

diſcourſe, but to *vindicate* and approve my *charity* to the *Diatribiſt*, as I have hitherto done my *doctrine* againſt him. And as this is by his *concluſion* impoſed on me as my task, ſo I doubt not but to find it an *eaſy* one, if he will weigh my *actions* in the ſame *balance* which he uſeth for his own, nay I wiſh he could as eaſily *clear* himſelf, who hath thus judged me.

2. His words are theſe, §. 43. by way of *concluſion* of that firſt *Exercitation*, *And now the Dr. may be pleaſed to review, and if he will recal his bitter falſe uncharitable concluſion* §. 57. 58. *unbeſeeming both his piety and gravity. For now it will appear that the charge of Superſtition on ſome men is no Mormo, nor yet unjuſt, but what is avowed by himſelf and party to be their opinion and practiſe, and what is proved to be really Superſtitious according to the true notion of the word Superſtition among Reformed Orthodox Divines.*

3. In *obedience* to his *admonition*, and in a *ſolemne dread* of having ſaid any thing *bitterly*, *falſely*, *and uncharitably*, and without any manner of *incitation* againſt the *Diatribiſt*, who uſeth this *language* (which if it be not found to have perfect *truth* in it, muſt be acknowledged to be very *uncharitable*, I need not adde, *bitter* toward me) I have *warily* and *ſuſpiciouſly* reviewed thoſe *Sections*, and I ſhall deſire the *indifferent* Reader to do ſo too, and to tell me what *ſyllable* or *minuteſt* part of them there is, which can any way deſerve from any *diſpaſſionate* perſon, the title either of *falſe* in any degree, or of *uncharitable* or *bitter* in relation to any man then or now living.

4. For this I muſt *premiſe*, that the ſevereſt *Satyre* againſt a *vice*, and not a *perſon*, which carries perfect *truth* and *juſtice* in it, that repreſents a *damnable ſin* in the *uglyeſt colours*, and no otherwiſe reflects upon the *perſon* of any man, then as his own *conſcience* ſhall be thus *awakened* with a ſight of his own *guilt*, is ſo far from either *uncharitable* or *bitter*, (unleſs in the notion wherein the *wholeſomeſt Phyſick* or moſt *neceſſary Chirurgery* muſt undergo the ſame *cenſure*) that it is the greateſt and moſt *obliging Chriſtian* act of *mercy*, and *kindneſs*, and *ſoveraign charity*, that *piety* and *gravity* can ſuggeſt to any. And unleſs it aſperſe (by affixing ſuch *vices* to) *particular* perſons, eſpecially thoſe who are not *guilty* of them (as here the *Diatribiſt*

hath in plain words affixt that *foul sin* of *Superstition* on the *Dr. personally*, and inlarged it to *his party*, which he knows must involve all the *obedient* sonnes of the *Church* of *England*, for the *Dr.* cannot with any tolerable *charity* be said or thought to be of any *other party*) there is no ground of *charge* of the least *asperity* in this.

5. And then it is most certain that those 2 *Sections* can no wise fall under this *censure*, the summe of them being no more but this, that if the *crime* of *Superstition* were fastned on none but those on whom the *Scripture* directs to fasten it, all that have opposed our *Church* in point of *rites* and *ceremonies*, and branded the *innocent* as guilty of no lesse *crime* then *Superstition*, must be obliged to return to *peace* and *charity*, and *perswasions* of *kindness* toward us, whereas the *contrary* humor of those who oppose and maligne our *Church*, daily *inflames* and *advances* into that *diabolical* sin of *calumniating*, and *accusing* the most *innocent* observances of those, whom they have undertaken to *oppose*, and never considers or looks on those many *grosser crimes*, *spirituall pride*, *uncharitablenesse*, *faction*, nay *sacrilege* and *profanesse* it self, with so much expression of *aversion* or dislike, as on the usage of a *few* and *wholesome ceremonies*.

6. This is, as neer as I can briefely *paraphrase* it, the sense of those two *Sections*, and all the *asperity* that is there discoverable, is but this, that *enemies* and *calumniators* have learnt two of the *Devils attributes*, Σαλανᾶς or ἐχθρὸς ἀνὴρ, and διαβολὸς or κατήγορος τ ἀδελφῶν, and as long as this hath palpable truth in it, and when I applied it not (so much as in my *thoughts*) either to this *Diatribist*, whose name I think I had never heard of, nor to any other *particular* person, and as long as it was *visible* that there was such *enmity* abroad in this *nation*, which thus *fortified* it self by *calumniating* others, and it being certain that it was perfect duty of *charity*, to indevour the *deterring* and *preserving brethren* and *fellow Christians* from such *guilts* and *dangers*, and that the pointing at other sinnes that much more justly deserved *censure*, might be usefull to that end, by way of but *necessary diversion*, I can with perfect *peace* of *mind* review those *Sections*, not discerning any *man*, or *virtue*, *moral* or *Christian*, any branch of either part of my *duty*, against which

which I have offended; And I now deſire the *Diatribiſt*, if he be not fully of my *perſwaſion*, that he deſcend to the *particularity*, and tell me the man in the *world* to whom I was in thoſe *Sections uncharitable* or *bitter*, and firſt to whom *uncharitable*, and then for the *falſeneſs*, that hath by all this *reply* to this *Diatribe*, been, I hope, ſufficiently *conteſted*.

7. And having ſaid thus much in *vindication* of my ſelf, I can very well abſtain from making uſe of the *advantage*, which is here *viſibly* given me, of more then *recriminating*; I am ſo well ſatisfied with my own *innocence*, that I cannot be farther gratified with the *contemplation* of others *guilts*.

8. And ſo much for his *firſt exercitation*, having I hope competently ſecured the *obſervance* of the *rites* and *ceremonies* of our *Church* from being the *introducing* of any *new worſhip*, or *criminous exceſs* againſt any of the *Commandments* of the *firſt table*, and conſequently from the charge of *Superſtition* in any juſtifiable notion, or *Etymologie*, or *acception* of the word, not taking that of *Super Statutum* to be ſuch.

Chap. V.

Of Will-worship.

Sect. 1.

The state of the Question. Will-worship distinguisht from the circumstances of it. The matter of mans will of three sorts. The 6. several possible notions of Will-worship. The application of them to the matter in hand. The vanity of the Diatribists distinction The scope of the 2d Commandment.

Numb. 1. IN the *Diatribe* of *Will-worship*, the first complaint is, that the *Dr. had not (as it became him) distinguished the words* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in Greek, or Will-worship in English, before he began his defence of them*] and to repair this *unbecoming defect* on the *Doctors* part, the *Diatribist* is pleased to do it for him, by assigning it a *double* notion, 1. For *voluntary, spontaneous* or *willing worship*, i. e. *willingness* or *freeness in worship commanded by God,) and then they were to blame*, saith he, *that put an ill notion upon them*, or 2. *For worshippe devised by the wit and appointed by the will of man, as contradistinguished to the will and wisdome of God, and then it was not so much the ill fortune as the just punishment of them to pass under an ill notion &c. For the scope of the 2d Commandment in the affirmative part being this, God must be worshipped with his own prescribed worship, and in the negative, to forbid all devised worship of God by the wit or will of man, the very name of will (of man) put to worship of God, as opposed to the will of God, the onely rule of worship, is as a brand in the forehead of it, to characterize it as condemnable in all.*

This his first §. I have thus fully set down, as the *foundation* of his *discourse* on this *subject*, and very fit for my *direction* how to proceed in the *reply* to it; For if I shall now punctually obey his *admonition*, and having, in his opinion, formerly *failed* of

of my *duty*, speedily indevour to *repair* it, 1. by *distinguishing* the *Greek* and *English* word (though by giving it the exact *limits* in that one place, where it is used in *Scripture*, I had hoped well that I had formerly performed all that was *necessary* in this kind) and telling him clearly in what *sense* I take it, defending it to be no way *reprovable*; and 2. by shewing the *unfitnesse* of his *distinction* here premised, and the *fallaciousnesse* of the *reason*, or *proof* annexed to it, me thinks this should set me on a good way toward the end of this second *Stage*, and so do that which is most desireable to the *Reader* and my self, confer much to our *expedition* in this journey.

3. For the first then, I shall distinguish, as formerly betwixt θρησκεία *worship*, whether the *theological virtue*, or some act thereof, together with the *gradual intension* and *extension*, the *degrees* and also the *frequency* or *number* of those *acts*, on one side, and the *external ceremonies* or *circumstances* of it, on the other side, which are not *parts* but *accidents* of *worship*; As in any other habit, that of *justice* particularly, may be exemplified, It may beside the *virtue* of *justice*, signifie 1. some *act* of that *virtue*, or 2. the *degree* thereof, and *frequent* repetition (more or lesse) of the *acts* of it, but for the *circumstance* of *time* or *place* attending on any *act* of it, they will never be called *justice* with any *propriety*.

4. *Secondly*, For [*will*,] the other ingredient in the *composition* of the word, meaning thereby the *will* or *choice* of man, it may be of *four* sorts, distinguishable by the *matter* which is *will'd* or *chosen*, 1. when the thing thus *will'd* by *man* is *forbidden* by *God*, or 2. when 'tis *commanded* and under *obligation*, as far as the force of *affirmative precepts* extends (of which the *rule* is true, that *obligant semper, sed non ad semper, they oblige* us *alwayes*, but yet do not *oblige* us to be *always exercising* some act of the *virtues* so *commanded*) and so when it is done, it is done in perfect *concord* with, and agreeablenesse to the *precept*, but yet for that *time*, or in that *degree*, it lay not under *particular precept*, but might without *disobedience* or *sin*, have been *omitted*. 3. When the thing *will'd*, is left *free* and *indifferent*, neither *commanded* nor *forbidden* by *God*. 4. When although it be not *indifferent*, much lesse *forbidden*, but *good* in an *high* degree, yet it is not under particular *precept*, and so may be *omitted* without *sin*, & when it is done, it

is highly *rewardable* by *God*. I shall give an example of each of these branches also; Of the first, when a man himself *commits*, or teacheth others to *commit adultery*, *adultery* being *forbidden* by *God*, and so his *action* or *teaching*, an act of his *will* opposed to the *will* of *God*. Of the second when I give to the *poor*, *yearly*, or *weekly*, such a *proportion* out of my *estate*, which I am able to give (and so offend against no *office* of *justice* in *giving*) and yet am not *obliged* to give by any *precept* of *Gods* which laies it as a *duty* upon me. An instance of which, is set down at large in the *Tract* of *Wil-worship* §.32. which together with other *exemplifications* of the point in hand, very necessary to *cleer* my sense, and yet in no reason here to be repeated, I must desire the *Reader* to fetch from that place §. 30. and so forward. Of the third, when I *walk* or *sit* still, *laugh* or *weep*, the *law* of *God* leaving it perfectly free for me to *do*, or *omit*, either of these as I shall choose. Of the last all writers, *Jewish*, *Heathen*, and *Christian*, give us frequent examples. *Maimonides* among the *Jewes* [a] *More Nevoch*. par. 3. c. 17. mentions it as the common saying of the *Iewish Doctors*, that *Reward is by God given to him that doth any thing uncommanded*. Among the *Heathens* one for all, *Plutarch* who instances in *acts* [b] of *fortitude*, *freeing the city from Tyrants doing any great thing*, *which* (saith he) *are not* νόμιμα, or ὑπὸ νόμου ὁρίσθεντα, *required or commanded by Law*. *For* (saith he) εἴπερ ὁ νόμος προστάττει, πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἀπειθοῖεν καὶ παρονομοῖεν ὅιγε μὴ ἀριστεύοντες &c. *if the Law command such things, then all must be counted* παράνομοι *disobedient and breakers of Lawes, which deserve not reward in warre, which let the Tyrants live an houre, or which do not some of those other things which are accounted excellent and by consequence all such must be punished as offenders.* So *Nazianzen* of the *Christian Law*, τῆς ἡμετέρας νομοθεσίας τὰ μὲν ἀνάγκην ἔχει τοῖς ἐπιταττομένοις ἃ καὶ μὴ φυλάττουσι κίνδυνον, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀνάγκην, αἵρεσιν δὲ, ἃ φυλάττουσι μὲν τιμὴν καὶ ἀντίδοσιν, μὴ φυλάττουσι δὲ οὐδ' ὁντινοῦν κίνδυνον. *Of our Law some things lay necessity on them to whom they are given* (i. e. saith the *Scholiast*, Ἡμῖν Χριστιανοῖς, *(on us Christians) and danger to them who observe them not. Others impose no necessity, but are left to choice, bring honor and reward to the observers, but no kinde of danger to them that perform them not*, adding that *as he that doth not deserve punishment*, *doth*

[a] p. 381.

[b] τὸ ἀριστεῦσαι τυραννοκτονῆσαι ἢ ἄλλο κατορθῶσαι. Plut. lib. περὶ εἱμαρμ.

doth not preſently deſerve praiſe, ſo neither doth he that doth not deſerve praiſe preſently incur puniſhment: So among the *Latins*, *Tertullian* ſpeaking both of *continence* and of *abſtinence*, in his book *de cultu Fœmin.* (long before he was under any ſuſpicion of *Montaniſm*) c. 9. *Multi propter regnum Dei fortem & utiq; permiſſam voluptatem ſponte ponentes. Many there were which for the Kingdom of God voluntarily and of their own accord parted with that great and lawful pleaſure of women.* And again, *Quidam ipſam Dei creaturam ſibi interdicunt, abſtinentes vino, animalibus exultantes, quorum fructus nulli periculo aut ſolicitudini adjacent, ſed humiliatem animæ ſuæ in victu quoq; caſtigatione Deo immolant. Some interdict themſelves the creature of God, abſtein from wine, and living creatures, the uſing of which is perfectly free and ſafe, and ſo by chaſtiſing of the body, ſacrifices to God the humility of the ſoul.* So S. *Hierome ad Demetriad.* ſpeaking of *Chriſts* words of *ſelling* and *giving to the poor*, *Non cogo* (ſaith he in *Chriſts* name) *non impero, ſed propono palmam, præmia oſtendo, Tuum eſt eligere, ſi volueris in agone & certamine coronari. Chriſt doth not command it or compel to do it, but propoſeth rewards, and thou if thou wilt be crowned muſt make the choice.* And *ad Pammachium*, *Non tibi imponitur neceſſitas, ut voluntas præmium conſequatur, No neceſſity is impoſed on thee, that thy will may obtain reward.* And *adverſ: Helvidium*, Of *Virginity*, *Virgo majoris eſt meriti, dum id contemnit, quod ſi fecerit, non delinquit. A Virgin is of greater worth, while ſhe contemns that, which if ſhe do, ſhe offends not.* And *adverſ: Jovinian: Ideo plus amat Virgines Chriſtus, quia ſponte faciunt quod ſibi non fuerat imperatum, Therefore Chriſt loves them more, becauſe they of their own accord do that which was not commanded them.* So *Chryſoſtom* formerly produced on *Rom:* 8. Οἱ πνευματικοὶ πάντα πράττουσιν ἐπιθυμίᾳ καὶ πόθῳ, καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσι τῷ καὶ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ ἐπιτάγματα. *The Spiritual do what they do with appetite and deſire, and demonſtrate it in that they alſo exceed commands.* So *Caſſian Chryſoſtoms* ſcholar, *Coll.* 22. c. 30. *Perfecti ſub gratiâ evangelii conſtituti, voluntariâ legem devotione tranſcendunt* &c. *They which are perfect now under the grace of the Goſpel, do tranſcend the law by voluntary devotion.* And *c.* 29. he ſpeaks of *worldly men, qui nihil Deo voluntariè offerunt, who have no free-will-offering*

ring for God. And so *Gregory Moral: in Job: Quidam praecepta legis perfectione virtutum transcendunt, Some men transcend the precepts of the law by perfection of virtues.*

6. To apply all this *apparatus* to the present matter, the *stating* of the *question* in hand, the word ἐθελοθρησκεία *Will-worship* as terminated in the *one God*, the *object* of *worship*, cannot be imagined to denote any more then some one of these six things, 1. the performing any sort of *worship* to *God*, which is *forbidden* by him, which yet is not truly but *equivocally* called *worship*, as when the *Pharisees* persecuting the *Apostles*, was by them styled *the doing God service*, and the like. 2. The using any *ceremony* in the *worship* of *God*, which either is particularly *forbidden* by *God*, or bears *analogy* with those which are certainly *forbidden*, as among *Christians sacrificing* of *beasts*, &c. 3. Burthening the *worship* of *God* with many whether *ridiculous* or *unprofitable ceremonies*, which though they are no where *forbidden* severally by *God*, yet by their *multitude* become an hindrance to *devotion*, or a yoke too heavy for *Christians*. 4. Using or instituting one or more *ceremonies*, no way *forbidden*, and yet no where *commanded* by *God*, but yet such as the *institution* or *using* any of them, is founded in some *pious* or *prudential* consideration, whether of *decency*, as when any *gesture* of *bodily reverence* or *humility* is used or *appointed*, or for *edification*, as when *feasts* not *prescribed* by *God*, are set apart by the *Church*, and so by *men*, for the *commemoration* of any eminent *mercy* of *God*, for the proposing some *exemplary virtues* to others &c. and withal that care is taken, that they are no way *offensive* by the *number* of them. 5. *Offering* to the service of *God* any thing of which *God* hath any way revealed that he will accept of, and reward, if it be duly *performed*, though he do not by any *law* exact it from every man, as dedicating himself to the *ministery*, doing it without any *hire* or *payment* here, *vowing vows* of building *Hospitals*, *Churches* &c: and most eminently *martyrdome*, when it may possibly, and without *sin* be avoided by *flight* &c. but yet the man thinks it may much *tend to Gods honor* in the good of *souls*, if he thus seal and publickly *testifie* his *obedience* to *Christs* commands by his *blood*, and accordingly *chooseth* to do so. Lastly, when either for the degree or frequency of repetition of any known *act* of *worship*, a man doth more then he is by

Gods

Gods law ſtrictly required to do, *prays* oftner every day, *faſts* oftner (ſuppoſing he no way hurt himſelf, or omit the performance of any other *duty*, by ſuch *frequency* in either of theſe) gives a more *liberal* proportion out of his eſtate to *pious* and *charitable* uſes, then any *precept* of *Chriſt* obligeth him to do, and the like.

7. As for that of a *cheerful* and ſo *voluntary* performance of any *act* of *commanded worſhip*, I take not this in at all, ſuppoſing that in the *commands* of *God*, not only the *action*, but the *cheerfulneſſe* of the performance is in like *manner commanded* by *God*, and ſo *neceſſary*, not *voluntary*, as that referres to the *will* of *man*, diſtinguiſht from the *command* of *God*.

8. Now for the *two* firſt of theſe, it is by me moſt readily acknowledged, that they are *criminous*, and of theſe I *plead* not the cauſe in the leaſt, either here, or in the *tract* of *Will-worſhip*, nor do I apprehend that either of theſe are truly and properly capable of that title of *will-worſhip*, or called by it, in that one place of *Scripture*, *Col*:2.

9. Of the *third* ſort alſo I acknowledge my diſlike, but yet again think it not applicable to the notion of the word in the *Apoſtle*, but rather to that by *Epiphanius* uſed of the *Phariſee*, ἐθελοθρησκείαν *exuberance*, or *ſuperfluity* of *Will-worſhip*, where ſtill the fault is the *multitude* and *unprofitableneſſe* of theſe *ceremonies*, not ſimply the uſe of any *one*, and ſo of *each* of *them*, the *ſuperfluity*, and not the *uncommandedneſſe* of *them*.

10. Of the *fourth* ſort, though I muſt affirm that it hath nothing *culpable* in it, but rather *commendable*, as *referrable* to the *Apoſtle's command* of *decency* &c. yet becauſe it is not *worſhip* it ſelf, but an *extrinſecal* attendant of it, I need not allow that the *title* of *Will-worſhip* neither, nor apply to it the *Apoſtles* uſage of the word *Col*. 2. but refer it to thoſe *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, for which or againſt which no *command* or *prohibition* of the word hath interpoſed, of which I oft ſpake in the head of *Superſtition*, and vindicated it from that title.

11. Of the *fifth* it is that I formerly ſpake, and compared it with the *voluntary oblations* under the *Law*, and of that there is all reaſon to interpret the word in the *Apoſtle*, and that in a *notion* of *good* and *commendable* (no way of *vitious*) if it be truly ſuch as it

pretends to be, and if it be not *really* ſuch, it may yet have an appearance of that, and ſo farre an appearance of *Piety* or *Wiſdome*.

12. And ſo again for the *fixt*, or *laſt*, I have affirmed of it and I hope made it clear, that it is firſt *lawful*, then *commendable*, and rewardable by *God*, above a lower degree, or leſſe frequent exerciſe of the ſame ſort of *worſhip*, and yet is not under particular *precept*, as appears by this, that at that time, and in the ſame *circumſtances*, when it is thus laudable to give ſo much more, the giving ſomewhat leſſe is not a *ſin*, as is manifeſted in the *tract* of *Wil-worſhip*.

13. And ſo now I hope I have exactly obeyed the *Diatribiſt*'s directions, *diſtinguiſht* the words, and ſet the whole queſtion before him as *diſcernibly* as he could wiſh, and therein laid grounds for that juſt *defence* of a blameleſſe word, which was at large pleaded in the *tract* of *Wil-worſhip*. And then I need adde no more to ſhew the *impropriety* and *vanity* of his own *diſtinction* or *double ſenſe of Will-worſhip*, 1. *for ſpontaneous freeneſſe in worſhip commanded by God*, or 2. *for worſhip deviſed by the wit and appointed by the will of man, as contradiſtinguiſht to the will and wiſdom of God*. For as to the *former* branch of the *diſtinction*, as it is reſtrained to *worſhip commanded by God*, ſo it can be no *Species* of that *Will-worſhip*, which reſpects the *will* and *choice* of *man*, without any *neceſſity* particularly impoſed by *God*, and accordingly I have excluded it out of my *Scheme*, not out of any *unkindneſſe* to it, but becauſe it neceſſarily belongs to *another* head, the *cheerfulneſſe* and the *worſhip* being both ſuppoſed to be *commanded* by *God*, and ſo uncapable of this diſtant title of *Will-worſhip*. So that at the beſt imaginable, he hath branched *Will-worſhip* into but *one* part, and that was not the *way* of *diſtinguiſhing* that tearm.

14. Then for the other *member*, it is ſo ſet that it hath many improprieties in it, and in brief is that great *fallacy* to which *Ariſtotle* refers moſt others, *fallacia plurium interrogationum* (and I remember the * *Jews* have a rule of their *Urim* and *Thummim* אין שואלין צל שני דברים כאחד *they aſk not of two things at once*) *confounding* and putting together things that are moſt *diſparate*, as hath already appeared by the ſeveral *Species* here ſet down, which

* *Maim: Hal: Kele-hammikduſch* c. ult.

which were to be *diſtributed* into their ſeveral *claſſes*, ſome *contradiſtinguiſht* indeed to *the will and wiſdom of God*, but none of thoſe *defended* by me, others only not particularly *commanded* by him, or impoſed *ſub periculo animæ*, but very *conſonant* and agreeable both to *Gods will* and *wiſdom*, and ſo ſtill μηδὲν ὑγιὲς, I have very little to *thank* him for in his *diſtinction*.

15. As for his *ſumme and ſcope of the ſecond Commandment*, with the name of S. *Auguſtine* and the *Doctor* in the *margent*, it already appears how little force it hath againſt my *pretenſions*, it being evident that the words there cited both for the *affirmative* and *negative* part of the *Commandment*, belong to *eſſential* parts of *Gods worſhip*, thoſe only being *preſcribed* and particularly *appointed* by *God*, not to each circumſtance thereof, whether of *time*, or *place*, or *geſture*, which among us tis certain are not particularly *preſcribed* by *God*, and yet we can ſo farre judge of his *will*, by many indications of it, that he no way *reproves* or diſlikes our *voluntary obſerving*, or the *churches appointing* of ſuch, and to theſe only he knows this controverſie here belongs, as applied to the *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals* of our *Church*.

Sect. 2.

The method of of explicating difficulties in the new Teſt: Θρησκεία in a good ſenſe: and when in a bad, no prejudice to ἐθελοθρησκία.

1. IN his ſecond §. where he profeſſeth not to *care how oft or how ſeldom the Greek word is uſed in other Authors, or the tranſlators of the old Teſtament, when the thing ſignified, deviſed or impoſed worſhip by the will of man, is ſo decryed in Scripture*; I ſhall to his *faſtidious* deſpiſing my *method* propoſed, returne my *reaſon* of reteining it, and to his reaſon, a brief *demonſtration* of the vanity of it. *Numb.* 1.

2. For the *firſt*, the *reaſon* of my *method* in that, as in other diſcourſes, was the great *affinity* and *conſent* betwixt the *Greek* of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, the writers being of the ſame *nation*,

Jewes by birth, which had acquired ſome skill in the *Greek Language*, and yet not ſo much *exactneſs* therein, as wholly to aſſume the *dialect* or *character* of ſpeech obſerved by native or *Learned Greeks*, or to deveſt themſelves of the *idiomes* of their *own* language.

3. Upon this *ground* I ſuppoſe it moſt conſequent, that for the explaining all *verbal difficulties* in the *New Teſtament*, reſort ſhould firſt be had to the *Greek Tranſlators* of the *Canonical Books*, or the writers of the *Apocryphal* of the *old*, and then in the *ſecond* place to other *good* Authors, from whom any light can be fetcht, and when theſe fail in their expected *aids*, then to make uſe of other ſupplies, *analogie* of *phraſes* or *matter*, with what we find in the *Old Teſtament*, *circumſtances* of the *context*, and the like.

4. And if the *Diatribiſt* deſpiſe this *method* of ſearch, it were but neceſſary *charity* in him, to diſcover the *faults* of it and direct us to a *better*, which having not here done, he leaves us to ſurmiſe, that it was not his *judgement*, but his care to *ſerve* his own *hypotheſis*, which infuſed theſe diſlikes into him, for otherwiſe, the reſult of my way of ſearch being onely this, that the word ἐθελοθρησκεία being but *once* uſed in the *whole Bible*, *Col.* 2. 23. the notion of it in that one place, muſt in all reaſon be reſolved to be that which properly belongs to that place, eſpecially if it proves to be ſuch as agrees exactly with the נדבה or *freewill offerings* in the *Old Teſtament*, I ſee not what *infirmity* it was which could render it up to his *deſpiſing*.

5. However, this wholly *removes* and evacuates all *force* of his *reaſon* of *diſlike*, it being evident by that one example of *freewill offerings*, but much more ſo by other *evidences*, both there and here added, that there may be many *acts* of *worſhip*, many *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, yea and many heights of *Chriſtian heroical virtue*, which may bear *proportion* with *worſhip*, that are not under *obligation*, from any particular *command* of *Gods*, and ſo remain to be *acts* of the *will* or *choiſe* of *man*, which are perfectly *lawfull*, *acceptable*, yea ſome *highly rewardable* by *God*, and ſo far from the guilt which *Mr. C.* affixes, of *high indignity or affront to the divine Majeſtie*.

6. What he addes of the ſimple word θρησκεία and θρησκεύω, that

that *they are but twice apiece uſed in the Book of Wiſdome, and alway in an ill notion, which* ſaith he, *is but little to the credit of the compound* ἐθελοθρησκεία] might ſure have been ſpared, it being as certain and *viſible* to him, that the ſame word is uſed by St *James*, c. 1. 27. in as good a ſenſe as could be wiſht, with the *epithets* of καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος *pure and undefiled before God*, added to it, and v. 26. for the *profeſſion* of *Chriſtianity*, though for want of actions, *bridling* the *tongue*, and the like, that becomes μάταια *vain*; And as plain, that the word is in it ſelf *equally* applicable to the *true* as to the *falſe*, indifferently to any *religion*, to St *Pauls religion* among the *Jews*, *Act.* 26. 5. *the ſtricteſt ſect of our religion*, to the *worſhip* of *Angels*, Col. 2. 18. and ſo to the *worſhip* of *Idols* in the *Book* of *Wiſdome*, which yet can no more tend to the *diſadvantage* of the *compound* ἐθελοθρησκεία, when that is not terminated on any *prohibited object*, then the uſe of the *Latine cultus* ſometimes for the *worſhip* of *falſe Gods*, can prejudge *voluntarius cultus*, *voluntary worſhip*, when *either the object* is not *ſpecified*, or the mention of the *one true God* is added to it. It being *confeſt* and ſuppoſed by *both* parties in this *conteſt*, that the ſimple θρησκεία or *worſhip* it ſelf is not *culpable*, ſave onely when the other part of the *compoſition*, the ἐθελο, i. e. the interpoſition of the *will* (or as he will ſtyle it, the *deviſe* or *appointment*) of *man*, hath an *influence* upon it.

Sect. 3.

His entrance on the view of Col. 2. *anſwered. The difference betwixt Commands of Magiſtrates and impoſition of dogmatizers. What tis which is ſaid to have* λόγον σοφίας.

HIS 3^d §. is his entrance on the view of *Col.* 2. where onely the word *Will-worſhip* is to be found; and in ſetting down his grounds of interpreting it, 1. He citeth *Beza* and Bp. *Davenant*, whoſe words are preſently anſwered, by adverting to the *diſtinction* formerly given betwixt the *eſſentials* and *circumſtantials*, the *parts* and the *ceremonies* of *worſhip*. *Numb.* 1.

2. 2dly. He pretends to discover a *mistake* in me, in that I observe from v. 22. that St *Paul speaks not of commands but doctrines, not of the prohibition of the Magistrate, but of false teachers imposing them as the commands of God*; *Whereas*, saith he, *the Apostle speaks expressely of these impositions, that they were after the Commandments and doctrines of men*, v. 8. *after the traditions of men to worship God by the observation of them.*] Of which words of his, if there be any *shadow* of *force* in them by way of *exception* against me, the meaning must be, that the *Apostle* there speaks of the *commands* or *prohibitions* of *Magistrates* in things of themselves perfectly *indifferent*, and censures those *commands* under the style of *Will-worship*.

3. But then this hath no degree of *truth* in it, for 1. The matter of the *commands* is no *lawful* matter, but either the *worship* of *Angels* (and that is *criminous*, as the *worshipping* of a *creature*) or the reducing of *antiquated* rites of *Judaisme*, which ought not to be reduced, being once *cancelled* and *nailed* to the *cross* of *Christ*. 2. The *commands* were not *commands* of *Magistrates*, but of men which had no *authority* to prescribe any thing, especially so contrary to the doctrine which the *Apostles* had planted among them, the *Christian* liberty from the *Judaical* yoke. 3. The *manner* of imposing them was quite distant from that of the *Magistrates* giving *laws Ecclesiastical* or *Civil*, those are by way of *Canon*, as of things *indifferent*, in order to *decency*, and the like, without ever pretending them to be in themselves *necessary*, as commanded by God; these are *imposed* as from *God* when they are not so, and that is the known sin of *dogmatizing*, to which I formerly applied the place; And the word ἐντάλματα *commands*, signifies no more then so, being joyned with, and explicated by διδασκαλίαι *doctrines*, i. e. such things as *false teachers* require all men to do in *obedience* to *God*, or as if they were now *commanded* by him, when some of them, as *abstinencies*, &c. having once been required by *God*, are now *abolisht* by *Christ*, and the other, the *worship* of *Angels*, though it pretend not ever to have been *commanded*, but onely to be *acceptable* to *God*, is clearly *forbidden* by him.

4 So that here is a palpable *mistake* in the *Diatribist*, who observes them to be *commands* (meaning, as he must, if he censureth

or

or oppoſeth me, *commands* of *Magiſtrates*) and not onely *doctrines* of *falſe teachers*, when indeed *commands* and *doctrines* are all one, both joyned together to ſignifie theſe *dogmatizers*, pretending the things which they taught to be in force by *Divine command*, by virtue of the *Law* given to *Moſes*, and not onely ſuch as would be *accepted* by *God*, as of the *worſhip* of *Angels* I ſuppoſe was pretended by thoſe *falſe teachers*.

5. For this is to be remembred here once for all, that the *ſeducers* ſpoken of in that *Chapter* were the *Gnoſtick hereticks*, who made up their *Theologie* of *Judaical* and *heatheniſh additions* to the *Chriſtian truth*; from the *Jews* they had many abſtinences, ſuch as were now *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*, and thoſe they impoſed as *commands* of *God*, when they were not; and from the *heathens* the doctrine of the *Æones* or *Angels*, as *creators* of this *inferior world*, and ſo ſuch as might, with *Gods* good liking, be *worſhipt* by us.

6. *Laſtly*, Thoſe *commands* of theirs are not cenſured by the *Apoſtle*, as *acts* of *Will-worſhip*, or *blamed*, or put under any ill *character* for being *ſuch*, any more then for being acts of *humility*, which is ἐν σωφροσύνῃ joyned with *Will-worſhip* in that place v. 22. but as *intrenchments* on that *liberty* purchaſed for them by the *death* of *Chriſt* v. 20. which had cancelled theſe *Judaical ordinances* to all that were *dead with him*, i. e. to *Chriſtians*, and had turned all *Dæmon worſhip* out of their *hearts*, but had no way bound up the hands of his *Apoſtles* or their *ſucceſſors* the *Governors* of the *Church*, from inſtituting *ceremonies* or *feſtivals* among *Chriſtians*.

7. When the *Diatribiſt* addes of *Will-worſhip*, that it *had a ſhew of wiſdome but no more*, tis but a *begging* the *queſtion*, or if it pretend to be concluded from that *text*, it is without all ground ſo *pretended*; for if I ſhall grant λόγον σοφίας to ſignifie onely a *ſhew*, no *reality* of *wiſdome*, yet it is not of *Will-worſhip* that that is affirmed, any more then of *humility* (and I hope *humility* which is an acknowledged *Chriſtian* virtue, hath more then a *ſhew* of *wiſdome* in it) but of the *retrenchments* of their *Chriſtian liberty*, their δογματίζεσθαι v. 20. *ſubjection* to the *doctrines* and *impoſitions* of *falſe teachers*, which had λόγον σοφίας, ſome either *ſhew* or *reality* of *wiſdome* ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ

ταπει-

ταπεινοφροσυνη *in Will-worſhip and humility*, which they could not have, if either or both thoſe, when *really* belonging to any, had no more then a *ſhew* of *wiſdome* in them. But of this I have ſaid enough in the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*, §. 12.

Sect. 4.

The Magiſtrates power acknowledged. Inventing new ways of worſhip. Davids *appointing the Levites to waite from* 20. *years old, an act of a King, not of a Prophet.* Davids *laſt words.*

Numb. 1. IN the 4th. §. the main of this which I have now *vindicated*, is *acknowledged* by Mr. *C.* for ſaith he, *the Apoſtle hath here no reflexion on the Magiſtrates making Laws in indifferent things* (and if ſo, why was it judged a *miſtake* in the *Doctor*, when he ſaid, *the Apoſtle doth not ſpeak of commands, but doctrines*, i. e. *not of the prohibition of the Magiſtrate &c.* Certainly if the *Doctor* were *then miſtaken*, the *Diatribiſt* is *now*, who confeſſeth the ſame thing, which ſo lately he had *reproved*) All his quarrel is to the *Magiſtrates inventing a new way of worſhipping God*, and then I am ſure he hath no *real* quarrel to me, after all this *pompous* ſhew of *writing exercitations* againſt me, for I never was *advocate* for thoſe who *invented new ways of worſhipping God*, and if, as he ſaith, the *Papiſts* lie under that guilt, I have taken no fee from them, am under no obligation to *plead* for them, *they are of age, let them anſwer for themſelves.*

2. No more am I entertained of *counſel* for thoſe *falſe teachers*, who any way impoſe *antiquated worſhip* on *God's* people, ſuch are *ſacrificing*, *ſabbatizing*, *circumciſion*, and the like, and ſo all this while the *Diatribiſt* fights with the *aire*, and confeſſes as much as his *adverſarie* deſires of him, and then all that I have to complain of, is the *ad quid perditio hæc?* To *what purpoſe was all this waſte* of words and paper? I wiſh there were no more yet behind.

3. But in this 4th §. he is pleaſed to take notice of one *inſtance* of

of mine, that of *David* who appointed *Levites* to serve from the age of 20. *years*, whereas *God* by *Moses* had appointed it but from 25. *years* old &c. And I wonder what can be replyed to this my instance, to hinder it from concluding the *lawfulness* of *making humane Laws*, in such *circumstances* of *Gods worship*, and those *different* from the *Laws* of *God*. Why, 1. saith he, *'tis impertinent, for he brings it as an instance of the Magistrates power in a thing indifferent, whereas this was in a matter of religion, and more then so, in a matter formerly commanded by God.*

4. Having given this *first answer* under form of a *first*, I was in reason to expect a *second* to *supply* the *defects*, but the Reader will easily discern with me that there is no such, and therefore this *first* must bear all the *weight*. And to it I reply, 1. From his own confession, that it was in a *matter of Religion* and *more* then of *Religion*, then by the *argument à majori*, he must needs have *power* in the *lesse*, i. e. in a *thing indifferent*, and then sure my instance from *David* was *more* then home to my purpose (i. e. *pertinent*) it proved *more* then I pretended from it, and if the *Diatribists arguments* would do so too, I assure him, I should be *convinced* by them, I will never object to them that they have *abundantly* proved his *position*, but such acts of *Supererogation* he may well condemne (and will not probably be *guilty* of) who writes *Diatribæ* against all actions that *exceed*, as well as those that come *short* of the *Commandment*.

5. But then, 2. His answer to the *instance* of *David* being this, that this *action of Davids was against a former command of Gods, an altering of Gods appointment, and no way to be salved but by Davids being a Prophet, inspired by God or directed by some other Prophet, and not imitable by any Magistrate now*] What is it again but a remarkable *instance* what δουλεύειν ὑποθέσει can doe?

6. Tis true indeed *David* was a *Prophet*, *inspired by God* in things belonging to that office, and yet as true that he was a wise and *prudent King*, and that he made this *alteration* upon *prudential considerations set down in that place*, 1 *Chron.* 23. 25. and 28. &c. viz. because the *burthens* being not now so *heavy*, as formerly when they were to carry the *Tabernacle*, and all the *instruments* thereof, consequently the full *strength* of *years* was

not ſo *neceſſary* to the *undergoing* them, and beſides, by this means there might be more *Levites* to ſerve in the *Tabernacle*, then formerly there had been.

7. And it is not imaginable why in a matter of this *nature*, in ſuch a meer *circumſtance* of the *worſhip* or *ſervice* of *God*, and that ſo far from a *contrariety* to *God's command* (for he that layes it upon the *Levites* from 20. *years old*, no way *oppoſeth* him that had *impoſed* it onely from 25. and he that *commanded* it from 25. no way excluded thoſe of 20. from being added to the *ſervice*) *David* might not have *power*, as a *King*, or why any other *Magiſtrate* might not do the like, *command* what *God* had not before *commanded*, in a thing ſo perfectly *indifferent* as was the *age* of the *Levites*, wherein to *begin* and end *officiating*.

8. As for his proofes, that *David* made this *change* by the *Spirit* or *inſpiration* of *God*, as a *Prophet*, *firſt* from 1 *Chron.* 28. 19. *All this the Lord made me to underſtand in writing by his good hand upon me, even all the workes of this pattern, aſcribing it to the Spirit of God*, v. 12, 13. *Secondly*, by comparing, 1 *Chron.* 23. 27. with 2 *Sam.* 23. 2, 3. where, as by the *laſt words* of *David* the *Levites were numbred from* 20. *years old*, in the former place, ſo in the latter place it was ſaid of the *laſt words* of *David*, *the Spirit of the Lord ſpake by me &c.* Theſe are but a heap of *miſtakes*. For as the former place belongs onely to the *pattern* of the *Temple* which *Solomon* was to *build*, deſcribed there *particularly* in the *ſeverals* of it, from v. 11. and that *pattern* affirmed v. 12. to be had from the *Spirit* of the *Lord*, and ſo the [*all this*] confined to that *pattern*, and with no *equity*, or ground in the *text*, to be farther *inlarged*, or applyed to *Davids numbring* the *Levites* from 20. *years old*, ſo the *laſt words* of *David*, 1 *Chron.* 23. 27. are clearly *Davids laſt Will* and *Teſtament*, but the *laſt words*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 1. are the *laſt words* of *propheſie* that he delivered, it being evident that he ſpake many other *words* after that, as appears in the *Chapter*, and the *Book* following, 1 *Kin.* and of his *propheſies* it is, and not of his other *words*, that it there follows, *the Spirit of the Lord ſpake by me.*

Sect. 5.

Sect. 5.

Col: 2. 22. εἰς φθορὰν. Ἀποχείσθω. Δογματίζεσθε. στοιχεῖα κόσμου.
Placing worſhip. Chriſtian liberty. Marriage. The Gloſſes put on the commands of men.

1. HIS 5'ſ. is an *examination* of what I have ſaid for the *interpreting* of [ἃ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει] *Col:* 2. 22. This *phraſe* I have thus *rendred* and *paraphraſed*, *Theſe commands of abſtinencies* (*Touch not, taſte not, handle not*, v. 21.) *are all to deſtruction, or deſtructive, by the abuſe of them*, i. e. by *impoſing* them on *Chriſtians*, as *commands* of *God*, now when they are *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*, and for this I thought I had produced ſufficient *authority*, to vindicate the *interpretation* from the *cenſure* of *ſingularity*, the plain words of S. *Auguſtine*, and S. *Ambroſe*, or whoſoever it is that wrote the *Commens* which bear his *name*, *Sunt in interitum* &c. *they are to deſtruction and eternal perdition to them that believe them neceſſary to ſalvation*, and *ſunt omnia in interitum & corruptionem per abuſionem*, &c. *they are all to deſtruction and corruption by abuſe*, &c.

2. But without adverting to the *commodiouſneſſe* of the *interpretation*, or the *authority* of thoſe *ancient Fathers*, or giving any *anſwer* to what is ſaid to recommend this *interpretation*, he is pleaſed to take a much *eaſier* way, to aſk ſome *queſtions*, and offer ſome *exceptions*, *Firſt* he asks, *why I refuſe our tranſlation of theſe words?*

3. To this *queſtion* I anſwer, by rendring my *reaſons*, 1. becauſe I think this other *preferrable*, and I doubt not but when the *Diſtribiſt* findes it uſeful, he will do the like in this or any other controverſie; 2dly becauſe [ἐστὶν εἰς φθορὰν] cannot by any *propriety* of *ſpeech*, or *analogy* of the like *phraſe*, ſignifie [*are to periſh*] but either in an *active* ſenſe [*are to corruption*] as that in *falſe teachers* may denote *corrupting* or *ſeducing* of others to their *hereſies*, and particularly to thoſe abominable ſins, which by deteſting of *marriage* the *Gnoſticks* brought in, expreſt often in theſe *Epiſtles* by the word φθορὰ *corruption*, or elſe in a

neutral sense, *ad interitum to destruction.* 3dly Because though ἀποχρησις may possibly signifie *use*, as well as *abuse*, yet it is as easily replyed, that it signifies *abuse* as well, nay more properly and frequently then *use*; In the *Bible* it is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, never used either in the *verb*, or in the *substantive*, but in this place; but in other *authors* 'tis vulgarly used in *opposition* to χρῆσις *use*, Ἀποχρωμένων μᾶλλον ἢ χρωμένων αὐτῷ Λακεδαιμονίοις, in *Plutarch* of *Alcibiades*, the *Lacedemonians rather abused then used him*, and in *Apophthegg*: that *great men have good and ill friends*, εἴτε οἷς μὴ χρῶνται, οἷς δ' ἀποχρῶνται, *they use some and abuse others*, and many the like. 4^thly Because the Notion which the *Diatribist* from the *civil Lawyers*, out of *Festus* gives of the *Latin abusus*, is that of *consuming use*, whereas it is both improbable that S. *Paul* should take it from the *civil Law*, (much more *probable* that he should take it in the sense, in which we finde *abusio* sometimes among *Divines* for ἀποχὴ *abstinence* or not *using* at all: So *Prosper de vit: contempl:* l.2.c.22. *veraciter abstinentes escarum non naturas sed concupiscentias damnent, ac voluptates suas desiderati cibi vel potus abusione mortificent*, which sense also the words here would bear well enough, and be a more punctual *character* of the *Gnosticks abstinence* from *marriage*, by which they brought in all abominable villanies) and if he did, it would as fitly comply with *mine* as with *his* notion of it, for thus it signifies *abolition* or *wearing out*, ἀποχρῶμαι, *usu attero & obsolefacio*, and to that agrees *Phavorinus*, rendring ἀποχρῶνται by διαφθείρει, and *Suidas* by ἀπόλλυσι, *destroying*, and then this would be the rendring these *impositions* of [*Touch not*, &c.] which were once in force under the *Jewish* state, but now *abolisht* under *Christ*, are thereby to *destruction*, or *to ruin* of *souls*, as when the *Apostle* tells them in one place of these *ceremonies*, that they are ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ *Heb:* 8.13. *nigh to vanishing away, to abolition*, and upon that account in another place, that if they look upon them as things still in force among *Christians*, *Christ shall profit them nothing*: But this I do not really think to be the notion of Ἀποχρησις, because those that render it [*using*] generally apply it to the *meats*, which are *consumed* by *eating* (and by the way, *Oecumenius*, that understood it in this sense, read it not ἀποχρήσει but ἀποκρίσει, a word which denotes *casting out* of *excrements*) which yet most evidently belongs

longs to the δόγματα *doctrines* of *abſtinence*, not to *meats*, and indeed the *antecedent* (to which ἃ πάντα, *all which* referres) is, *Touch not, taſte not, handle not*, which denotes other *abſtinencies*, beſide that of *meats*, particularly that of *marriage*, which theſe *Gnoſticks* prohibited, and taught to be abominable, and that is not capable of this notion of ἀποχρήσει, *by uſing*, for ſure *marriage* doth not *periſh by uſing*. And the like may be ſaid of *unclean things*, the *leper*, the *dead*, that *Judaizers* would not *touch*, which yet did not *periſh*, were not *conſumed by uſing*.

4. And though in the next place the *Diatribiſt* leave it *indifferently* betwixt *meats* add *ordinances* of *abſtaining* (which are *contrary* enough) yet the notion of *uſing* is no way applicable to the latter; for what the *Diatribiſt* ſets for the *interpretation* of it [*now being out-dated they periſh with the uſing, without any ſpiritual advantage*] is ſure very ſhort, it being evident by other places of *Scripture*, that the *impoſing* theſe *out-dated obſervances*, is not only *not advantageous*, but moreover *hurtful*, thoſe being as the *Fathers* generally reſolve, not only *mortua, dead*, and ſo *profitleſſe*, but alſo *mortifera, deadly, deſtructive*; and ſure that is the meaning of [εἰς φθορὰν *to periſhing*, or *deſtruction*] whether it denote *damnation* it ſelf, or thoſe *horrible* or *unnatural* ſins, and the *ſeduction* of the *Gnoſticks* which certainly induce it.

5. In the 3d place he quarrels with my interpretation for ſuppoſing that theſe *abſtinencies* were *impoſed* and *taught* by the *falſe teachers* as *divine obliging precepts, whereas*, ſaith he, *there is little or nothing in the text to import that*. What will with him, when produced againſt his ſenſe and intereſts, be accounted *great*, I know not; but that there is *ſomething* in the *text*, to incline it this way, will ſoon be evident, 1. by the word δογματίζεσθε v. 20. That δόγματα and διδασκαλίαι, *doctrines*, ſignifie thoſe things which are *taught* as from *God*, *Mat.* 15. 9. hath been formerly ſhewed, and is *evident* from the form of *ſpeech*, *in vain do they worſhip me*, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, where the *commands* of *men* are *taught*, not as ſuch, but as *doctrines* of *God*; From hence the *active* δογματίζειν to *dogmatize*, ordinarily denotes *teaching* thoſe things to be *divine precepts*, and ſo obliging *conſcience*, which are not, and accordingly the *paſſive* δογματίζεσθαι

must needs denote the having such *weights* thus *imposed* upon them being *subject to ordinances* (or *doctrines*) as we rightly *render* it.

2. These are in the beginning of that 20. v. called στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου, *the elements of the world*, whether of the *Jewish* or *Gentile service*, both *nailed* to his *crosse* by *Christ*, *cancelled* in his *death*, but such as were incumbent on the ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ, *those that lived in the world*, being under those *elements*, or *initial ordinances*, though *Christians* were not. 3. These are specified what they were, *Touch not*, *taste not*, *handle not*, *abstinences* from *meats*, and from *marriage*; that of *meats* evidently a *precept* of *Gods* to the *Jewes*, and the *Gnosticks divinity* being in part compounded of *Judaism*, there is no reason to doubt but they *taught* these *abstinencies*, as the *Jewes taught* them, *i. e.* as *divine obliging precepts*, and joined *abstinence* from *marriage* to that of *meats*, in the same form, *i. e.* as under *precept* also.

6. As for that which the *Diatribist* addes to *confirm* his *objection*, viz: that in the *next verse they are called the commandments and doctrines of men*] it hath no force in it, for so really they were, and not of *God*, but yet were by the *false teachers* imposed under a more *honourable glosse*, as *commands* not of *men*, but of *God*, and therein their *false teaching* consisted. And it is strange the *Diatribist* could say of such *false doctrines*, that *they could not be pretended, much lesse imposed as a divine command*] Tis as if he should say, *False teachers* could not *teach false*, *hypocrites* and *deceivers* could not pretend the *authority* of *Scripture* for their *errors*, the *Devil* could not put on the appearance of an *Angel* of *light*.

7. So again 'tis with equal truth, that he saith, the *traditions were not pleaded to be the commandments of God, but expressely called the commandments of men*, *Mat.* 15.9. when 'tis evident that those *commandments* of *men* were by the *Pharisees* taught as δαιμονιώδεις *doctrines* and so *commandments* of *God*, though by *Christ* affirmed in truth to be opposite to *Gods real commands*, v. 3. 6. it being very ordinary with *hereticks*, and *hypocrites*, to *pretend* that to be the *will* and *command* of *God*, which is most extremely *contrary* to it. And in that the *Pharisees* sin and *hypocrisie* consisted.

8. *Fourthly*, he *would ask* me *another question, whether the placing*

cing the worship of God in the observation of those ordinances, though not taught or imposed as God's commands, were not an abuse of them, and εἰς φθορὰν; And I answer, 1. By *asking* what he means by the *worship* of *God*, if such as *man* may justly *prescribe* or *practise*, either *ceremonies* perfectly *lawfull*, but not *prescribed* by *God*, or *more* then so, that which is sure to be *accepted* by him, though yet it be not under *divine precept*, then 'tis certain 'twere no *abuse*; but if he mean the *commanded worship* of *God*, then his *question* implyes a *contradiction*, for whatsoever this *worship* of *God* is placed in, that is *taught*, as *command* of *God*, for else it were not *Gods prescribed worship*, which yet it is supposed to be. 2. That these *abstinencies* being of such a *nature*, that *Christ* removed all *ordinances* requiring them, and purposely designed that they should be left *free* to men, no *humane authority* could lawfully impose them, no man can *forbid marriage* to *Christians*, and so any such *command* were an *abuse* of *authority* if given by *lawful superiors*; (or if given by others, an act of *intrusion* and *usurpation*, for *who made them judges* or *dividers* of *tasks* to their *brethren*?)

9. But then this may not be extended to all *ceremonies* and *circumstances* of the *worship* of *God*, *times*, *gestures*, *&c.* for *Christ* never exprest any absolute *dislike* to all such, nor can the *imposing* of such, with *prudence* in respect of *choise*, and *moderation* in *respect* of *number*, be by any *analogie* reducible to those *abstinencies* of which the *Apostle* there speaks. Nay even for those, particularly *abstinence* from *marriage*, tis certain that it may be lawfully *practised* by him that *can bear* it, and that all the *error* is in *imposing* it on others, contrary to that *liberty* which *Christ* hath for *weighty* reasons allowed, and required to continue *allowable* and *honorable* among *Christians*.

Lastly, He argues from the following words, v. 23. where the *Apostle* sayes, they *have a shew of wisdome*, *in Will-worship*, not as the *commands* of *God*, and thence he concludes their *abuse* to be, not that they *imposed them as divine commands*, *but as parts of divine worship*; But I answer, that that *verse* is not the setting down the *abuse*, or the *defining* wherein it consists, but at the utmost, a *description* of the *faire glosses*, those *abstinencies* and *false worships* were capable of, viz. a *double shew* or *appearance*

rance of *piety*, one in *Will-worſhip*, *offering* to *God* a *free will offering*, for ſuch is every *uncommanded*, if *lawfull abſtinence*, but ſuch was not this, and therefore 'twas but a *ſhew* of *piety*; and another in *humility*, *worſhipping Angels* as the *miniſters* of *God*, *humility* indeed a moſt *Chriſtian virtue*, but this no *juſtifiable humility*, (To which alſo a *third* is ſubjoyned, that of *ſelf-denyal* or *auſterity*, of the *ſame* kind with the former) and ſo ſtill 'twas but a *ſhew*, no *reality* of *wiſdome* or *piety*, which conſiſted in this.

Sect. 6.

The Diatribiſt's way to make the Doctors words witneſs againſt him. Τί δογματίζεσθε χ' ἐντάλματα &c. *Placing worſhip, an equivocal phraſe.*

Numb. 1. But the *Diatribiſt* is ſo ſixtly reſolved on his way, that the *criminouſneſs* and *danger* of theſe *abſtinencies*, ſhall conſiſt in their being *deviſed* or *willed* by *men*, and not in the *Gnoſtick dogmatizing* or *teaching* them to be *commanded* by *God*, that in his 6t §. the *Doctor himſelf* ſhall (again, according to his *method* taken up in his *preface*) be brought in to *teſtifie* for him; To which purpoſe theſe words are cited from him, that *the danger conſiſts in impoſing on men humane ordinances or doctrines*, and then ſaith he, *ſtay there a while*, viz. that he may from thoſe words, taken alone, conclude, that *then they did not impoſe them as commands of God.*

2. But I know not what *obligation* lyes either on the *Reader* or me, to make a *pauſe*, upon his command, in the very *middle* of a *period*, when the words which are behind make theſe that are cited utterly uncapable of the *ſenſe* which he puts upon them; For thus the words lay in the *period* before he had the diſmembring of them, [*which words point out that wherein the danger doth conſiſt*, viz. *impoſing on men humane ordinances or doctrines*, i. e. *thoſe things, which though they are not commanded by God, are yet by men affirmed and*

and pretended and taught (though, as we say, magisterially and without proof) to be so commanded.

3. It is not possible any word should be more expressely *contrary* to the *Diatribists* conclusion, then these, which he thought fit to sollicite to bear *witness* on his side, and to that end cut them in the *midst*, and then, after the manner of the *serpent*, that *fed* upon it self, *suborned* and instructed one end to *devour* and eate up the other.

4. This he saw, and therefore in the end of that 6t. §. he mentions these latter words, as the *Doctors gloss of his own former words*, and saith, *they will now prove his own*, i. e. *singular*. And truely if they should *prove singular*, i. e. if no man in the world should be found to have ever said the like, but the *Doctor*, they would yet be sufficient for the turn to which they were designed, to *explicate* the *Doctors own* meaning, and to secure the *beginning* of his *period*, from being brought in *judgement* against him, and so might have saved the *Diatribist* the pains of this §. For sure no man was so fit to explain his *own* words, or to give his full sense in them, as he whose words they were, foreseeing that possible, which now hath happened, that otherwise they might be *mistaken*.

5. But then 2. I shall not acknowledge my *gloss* a *singular* one, but that which the *Apostles* word will own as a *natural* and perspicuous *paraphrase*, Τί δογματίζεσθε--κτ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων (reading the *middle* as in a *parenthesis*, specifying what δόγματα he means, and the specious *glosses* which they put upon them) why do you permit such *abstinencies prescribed* and taught you *really* by *men*, and not by *God*, to be *imposed* on you as *doctrines commanded* by *God*, just as when the *Pharisees* taught their own *traditions*, as the *doctrines* of *God*. That this is the very *literal* importance of δογματίζεσθαι, to be *subjected*, or to pay *obedience* as to a δόγμα or *command* of *Gods*, hath already been shewed, And if that be granted, there can be no farther doubt of the whole *expression*, nor consequently of the *propriety* of my *gloss* or *paraphrase* on it.

6. As for the *placing worship* in those *abstinencies*, that *equivocal* phrase was very lately examined, and must not again return to *exercise* us. If they *placed worship* in them, in this sense, that

they *did* or *taught* them as *parts* of *God's commanded worship*, tis the very thing wherein I placed the *danger*; If they delivered them as their *own doctrines*, and not as the *doctrines* of *God*, they did not then *place* any part of *God's commanded worship* in them; If they *taught* them as such things, which, though not *commanded* by *God*, would yet be *acceptable* to him, still, after they were *abolisht* by *Christ*, then they taught that which had no *truth* in it, for such kinds of *abstinencies* are not now *valued* by *God*, but more real *acts* of *self-denyal* set up in their *stead*, *mortifying* of *lusts*, and the like, which those *false teachers* were far from being *guilty* of. As for *ceremonies* of *decencie* and *order*, and *Festivals*, really designed to ends of *piety* and *edification*; they are neither of them *parallel*, nor bear any *analogie* with these which are here *censured*.

Sect. 7.

Of Petitio Principii. Of Λόγος σοφίας *being capable of two rendrings. The danger from mistake on the Diatribists side. My interpretation not singular. His no way probable.* Μὲν *a particle of extenuation, no* ἀντιπολογικόν. *No shew of wisdome in respect of the folly that is in it. The Will-worship parallel to the humility. The prime argument for my interpretation.* Σοφίας *for piety, vindicated from the contrary proofs.* φιλοσοφία. *Worship of Angels. No agreement betwixt* Col. 2. 18. and 23. *or betwixt* 23. and 1 Cor. 2. 4. Ἅπινα μὲν δὲ.

Numb. 1. HIS 7th §. is the arraigning of what my 7th had said concerning v. 23. Ἅπινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ &c. And all that he there saith will lose all force, if these two things may be observed or remembred, 1. That the *opposers* of the *ceremonies* of our *Church*, against whom that *tract* was *prepared*, founded their *conclusion* on these two *premises*, 1. That *Will-worship* was a *sin*. 2. That the using of *ceremonies* not *commanded* by *God*, was *Will-worship*. And therefore to our *vindication*

dication it was ſufficient, if upon ſurvey of that *one* place of *Scripture* where that word was uſed, it ſhould be found capable of ſuch an *interpretation*, which ſhould affix no *ill*, but contrariwiſe a *good character* on it; For herein the task lies on the *opponent* to prove his *affirmative*, that *Will-worſhip* is *criminous*, (and not on me to demonſtrate the *negative*) and that he can never do from this *text*, if in this *text* by a *commodious interpretation*, it be capable of a *good* ſenſe.

2. This I here premiſe, becauſe he ſo oft reminds me in this place of *begging* the *queſtion*, when I deny the word to be taken in an *ill* ſenſe, Of which *Elench* I cannot be *guilty*, unleſſe it were incumbent on me to *prove* and *demonſtrate* the *negative*, his *affirmative* being ſufficiently avoided, by my ſhewing that the *contrary* is *poſſible*, and not *improbable*, which therefore was all that was here required of me, and I hope is competently performed.

3. 2dly That if the words be capable of ſeveral *rendrings*, and either of theſe will free *Will-worſhip* from the *neceſſity* of an *ill* ſenſe, then again this is ſufficient for my turn, for then ſtill he hath not *unanſwerably aſſerted* his *concluſion*: This I ſay, to give an account, why I ſet down two poſſible *rendrings* of λόγον σοφίας, either *rationem ſapientiæ vel pietatis*, *reality of wiſdom or piety*, or elſe only *Speciem ſapientiæ*, a *ſhew*, or *bare appearance of wiſdom*; For of this it is certain that λόγος *ſignifies ratio* as well as *Species*, and much more ordinarily the *former*, and in caſe it ſhould here ſignifie the *former*, then tis unavoidably evident, that *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good*, not ill ſenſe; Mean while as I pretend not that *both* thoſe rendrings are *true*, for if it be only a *ſhew* of *wiſdom*, then it is no *reality*, ſo I profeſſe to yield ſo much to the *authority* of the *ancient interpreters*, as to pitch upon the latter only that of χρῆμα ἐκ ἀλήθειαν, a *ſhew* of *wiſdom*, *not the truth*, and even then, as hath been ſhew'd, the *Will-worſhip* there, is capable of a *good* notion, for how can thoſe *abſtinencies* or *doctrines* have ſo much as a *ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip and humility*, if *Will-worſhip* hath nothing of *wiſe* or *good*, but only of *wickedneſſe* (and that we know is *folly*) in it?

4. Having premiſed theſe two things, it is now very eaſie to diſcover the *fallaciouſneſſe* of all that is brought againſt me in this or the enſuing Sections; For as to the interpretation of the *verſe*,

which he propoſeth and preferres before mine, but without any *convincing proof* of the truth of it, this is on his part a *begging* the *queſtion*, which even now was charged on me, with much leſſe *reaſon*, and when he ſaith *mine may prove a miſtake*, tis ſufficient to reply, and ſo *may his*, and the *danger* farre greater from the *miſtake* on *his* ſide, then or *mine*, For if *mine* ſhould be ſuch, yet will it not follow that the *Ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* of our *Church* are ſuch *criminous Will-worſhip*, the uſing of theſe bearing no *analogy* with the *dogmatizing of* the *Gnoſticks*, or their reviving the aboliſht *Iudaical abſtinencies* among *Chriſtians*, whereas if *his* interpretation ſhould prove *falſe*, and mine *true*, his whole *fabrick* muſt utterly be *demoliſht*, and his *major* and *minor* having *both* failed, the one affirming *Will-worſhip* to be criminous, the other our uſing *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* to be *Will-worſhip*, his concluſion is not likely, I hope, to hold out long after, unleſſe it ſhall pretend to that *miracle* which is fancied of *Callimachus* (and denominated him an ἀθάνατ☉ πολεμιστὴς *an immortal warrier*, and ἑστῶτ☉ Ἄρε☉ εἰκὼν *the ſtatue of Mars*) who is ſuppoſed to ſtand and *fight* after he was *dead*; And then tis time to retreat from this *combatant*, with the *Epigrammatiſt*;

Αὐὲ κυβιερνήτα, νεκύ☉ φεύγωμεν ἀκοντὰς.

5. But then 2dly. when he vilifies *mine*, reſolving it *ſingular without any precedent, ancient, or modern, Proteſtant, or Papiſt, Firſt*, This hath no *truth* in it, as will *anon* ſufficiently appear, At the *preſent*, I ſhall only reminde him, that within two years after the *Treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip* was printed, came out *Grotius's poſthumous* notes on the *Epiſtles*, and thoſe are clear for this *interpretation*, and ſo though they could not be my *precedent then*, will *now* ſecure me from *ſingularity*.

6. *Secondly*, The *Diatribiſt's* interpretation is ſo far from being *demonſtratively* true, that it hath arrived to no degree of *probability*: It is this, that v. 23. *contains a reaſon of the danger and deſtructiveneſſe of thoſe abſtinencies*, viz: *becauſe they were no other, nor better then Will-worſhip with a faire pretence of wiſdom, becauſe the worſhip of God was lately placed in them, and they carry a great pretenſion of humility and ſelf-denyal in abſtaining from things pleaſing to the body.*

But

7. But I demand 1. how doth it appear that this *verſe contains a reaſon of the deſtructiveneſſe of thoſe abſtinences?* 'Tis not ſo much as introduced with a γὰρ, *for*, or any other form of *proof*, but ἅ πνα φ, which *things indeed have a ſhew*, &c. which is a form of *extennation* (as the *Diatribiſt* acknowledgeth in this §. ſpeaking of φ) and then cannot reaſonably be a *proof* of the *deſtructiveneſſe* of them, but the *conceding* ſomewhat, *ſpeciouſly* at leaſt, in *favour* of them, that they *have indeed a ſhew of wiſdom* in them.

8. 2dly What words are there in that *verſe*, which can bear, or give any *pretence* to that *paraphraſe*, that *theſe abſtinences are deſtructive becauſe no better then Will-worſhip?* The words in the *Diatribiſts* own rendring are no more but this, *which things indeed have a ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip and humility*; But can this bear or *induce* this *concluſion* in any *mood* or *figure*, Therefore they are *deſtructive becauſe no better then Will-worſhip?*

9. Is it not much *fairer* and more reaſonable, which I *concluded*, they *have ſome ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip, therefore Will-worſhip, if it be truly ſuch, hath ſome reality of wiſdom in it?* for elſe that which hath but a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in it, cannot have that *ſhew* in *reſpect* of *Will-worſhip*; *Adultery* being it ſelf *folly*, 'tis abſurd to ſay of any man, or doctrine, that it hath *a ſhew of wiſdom in adultery*, or in *reſpect* of the *adultery* that is in it, for that were to affirm it to have a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in no other reſpect but that it is *fooliſh*.

10. I acknowledge indeed that as it was but a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* which they had, ſo it was but a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip*, or *voluntary offering* to *God*, and ſo a *ſhew* of not a *true humility*; but ſtill that doth but the more *confirm* (not *confute*) my *concluſion*, that *Will-worſhip truly* ſo *called*, and *humility*, that *real* virtue, are branches of *Chriſtian wiſdom*, or elſe, the having but a *ſhew* of them, would not give them ſo much as the *ſhew* of *wiſdom*.

11. 3dly When the former part of his *paraphraſe* is [*they are no other nor better then Will-worſhip*] how can that be coherent which follows in the ſecond place, that *they carry a great pretenſion of humility and ſelf-denial?* when thoſe two are regularly joined with *Will-worſhip* [ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ, *in Will-worſhip and humility, and not ſparing the body*]

Certainly as the *humility* is, such must the *Will-worship* be, if the *humility* be only in *pretension*, then so must the *Will-worship* be also, in *pretension*, not in *truth*, and then still the *fault* or *defect* will be in the bare *pretending*, not in the *Will-worship*, as it is not in the *humility* or *self-denial*, by the *Diatribists* own confession, but in the *false pretending* them. How much then is it more reasonable to do what I did, *viz:* to allot to *Will-worship* and *humility*, and *self-denial*, to all three, the *same* state, whatsoever it be, whether of *virtue*, if they be *really* what they *pretend*, or of *hypocrisie*, if they be *bare images* or *appearances* of them? And on this I insist, as on the main ground of *inforcing* mine, and *invalidating* his interpretation that *Will-worship*, *humility*, *and self-denial* being here placed together in the same *classis* or *series*, they cannot be so separated, as that one shall be a *vice*, when the other two are acknowledged *virtues* in a *Christian*, one *really* what it pretends, and the other only *feignedly*, or in *pretence*, without any *reality* in them. When the *Diatribist* shall answer this argument, he may then tell others of *mistaking*, but till then, the *mistake* may much more *probably* be on his side.

12. *Thirdly*, What the *Diatribist* addes of σοφίας *wisdom*, which I took in the ordinary notion of *piety*, is sure more *strange* in him, then what he *censures* in me; *in the Proverbs and elsewhere* he acknowledges it must *signifie piety*, but here it must not, but literally *wisdom*, to which purpose he cites Bishop *Davenant*, who expresses it to denote *some excellent doctrine rather brought from heaven, then found out by men*; But if that be the meaning of it, then sure, as such, those *false teachers* taught it, i. e. as *coming* from *heaven*, and that is as a *doctrine* of *God*, and that was even now *denied*, when I affirmed it: 2dly How can those *abstinencies* have a *shew of coming down from heaven in Will-worship*, and yet *Will-worship* signifie *worship devised by the wit and will of man?* Tis as if he should say, they *pretend* to come from *God*, in that they come *only from men*; whereas in the notion of *wisdom* for *piety*, the words run very currently and intelligibly, they *pretend* to have *piety* in them, *viz:* such as is discernible in *Will-worship* or *free-will-offerings*, in *humility*, in *self-denial* &c: Well, that σοφία signifies *piety* in this place, I appeal to S. *Chrysostom*, δοκεῖ γὰρ εὐλαβὴς τὶς εἶναι, saith he, by way of *Paraphrase* of

ἔχει

ἔχει λόγον σοφίας. *he appears to be* (though *really* he be *not*) *pious, religious*; And *Theophylact* in the ſame words.

13. As for his proofs of the *contrary*, they are of no *validity*.

14. The *firſt* is from the *context* v. 8. where the *Apoſtle* calls it *philoſophie*; But firſt, v. 8. hath no *contexture* with v. 23. 2dly. φιλοσοφία is not λόγος σοφίας, the *philoſophie* there ſpoken of, the joyning of the Αἰῶνες or *Angels* with *God*, the *Gnoſtick Theologie* of the συζυγίαι, out of the *Platonick* and *Poetick Theologie* of the *heathens*, had not ſo much as a *ſhew* of any *excellent doctrine brought from heaven*, as the *Diatribiſt* even now from *Biſhop Davenant* expreſt σοφία to ſignifie, at leaſt not ſuch as of which S. *Paul* could affirme that it had any *image* or *ſhew* of ſuch.

15. 3dly. Tis confeſt on both ſides that the things here ſpoken of, and ſaid to *have a ſhew of wiſdome in Will-worſhip and ſelf-denyal*, are the δόγματα of *abſtinences* from *meats* and *marriages*, and thoſe abſtracted from the *error* of *dogmatizing*, have indeed a *ſhew* of *piety* in thoſe two reſpects, that he which *abſtains voluntarily* ſhall ſeem to *practiſe* a *ſpecial* piece of *ſelf-denyal*, and to *offer* to *God* a *freewill offering* of *abſtinence* from *meats* and *mariage*.

16. As for that of *worſhipping* of *Angels*, which I ſuppoſe a *corollary* of the *philoſophie*, v. 8. that alſo hath a *ſhew* of *piety* in *humility*, in *worſhipping* the *officers* and *miniſters* of *God*, as not daring to *approach* immediately to *God* himſelf; But then this, as it rather *confirmes* the notion of *wiſdome* for *piety*, then *confutes* it, ſo it cannot have any ſuch *influence* on the other branch of *abſtinences*, as to qualifie them to have any *ſhew* of *divine doctrine* in *Will-worſhip* and *humility*, eſpecially if *Will-worſhip* continue to ſignifie, as the *Diatribiſt* will have it, *worſhip deviſed by the wit and will of man*, for then, as was ſaid, they muſt have a *ſhew* of *coming from heaven*, in this very reſpect, that they *come not from heaven*, but from the *wit and will of men*.

17. His *ſecond* proof is, becauſe v. 18. the *worſhipper of Angels is ſaid to be puft up in his fleſhly mind*, i. e. *in a carnal conceipt of his own wiſdome, in finding out that way of worſhip*, and to that purpoſe *Irenæus* is cited not as an *approver* of this interpretation of σοφία (for in the place cited he ſpeaks not a word to *that* matter,

matter, not so much as *reflects* upon that *text*) but to * *testifie*, that the *fictions of men are by them counted wisdome.*

u Sapientiam rnusquisque eorum dicit, quam à semetipso adinvenit. Ir. l. 3. c. 2.

But to this I answer, 1. That this proof extends not to the *doctrines* of *abstinences*, which we know are the *immediate* antecedent, and the *principal* thing here spoken of. 2dly. That what

18. is said of the *worshippers* of *Angels*, that they are *vainly puft up in their fleshly minds*, is there set as an *aggravation* of their *crime*, and as the *cause* of their *assuming* to *know* what they *understand not*, whereas this of having a *shew* of *wisdome*, being introduced with the μὲν, which was by the *Diatribist* confest to be an *extennating* particle, cannot be designed to *aggravate* their sin, nor consequently to be parallel to that of v. 8. And so indeed to have a *shew* of *wisdome* in some respects, differs very much from being *vainly puft in their fleshly mind*, the one placing that *shew* in somewhat that is *really good*, though *falsely pretended* to, the other placing it in their *own carnal minds* which have nothing *good* in them. As for the place in *Irenæus* directed to in the margent, it speaks quite of another matter, mentioning neither of these *verses*, 18. or 23. and so cannot be vouched for an *authority* to prove that they are *parallel* one to the other.

What he addes, that it may very well be *parallel* to that place, 1 *Cor.* 2. 4, 5, 6. will be soon dispatched by any *reader* that shall *compare* the places, for he will certainly find that there is no kind of *agreeableness* betwixt them, the one speaking of the *arguments*, *miracles &c.* by which the *truth* of the *Gospell* was *conferred* to *men*, and not by *Topicks* of *humane perswasion*, the other of the *shew* of *wisdome* which the *Gnosticks doctrines* of *abstinence* had in them, which sure are things competently removed from any possibility of *corresponding* one with the other.

19. But saith he, to *assert those abstinences as a worship of God, to have somewhat of real wisdome or piety in them, is a plain begging the question now betwixt us*] To this I have premised the *answer* in the beginning of this §. shewing how far I am from a *possibility* of *begging* the *question*, whileſt I do but *answer* to the *argument* drawn from this *text*, and shew that it *may* well (I need not prove that it needs *must*) have some other *importance* then that in which alone their *argument* against *Will-worship* is founded. But then 2dly. I shall freely gratifie the *Diatribist*, and having mentioned that

that of πνὰ λόγον σοφίας for *ſome reality of wiſdome* or *piety*, onely as *poſſible*, I ſhall gladly yield, that it doth not ſo ſignifie here, but rather *ſome ſhew of wiſdome* or *piety*, and then I hope I do not *beg* but *grant*, *give* him the utmoſt in this, which he deſires, not *crave* any favour from one, who will no more willingly afford it.

19. What follows of my *denying Will-worſhip to be here condemned, but not proving it*, is a little *ſtrange*, when he knows I ſolemnly propoſe the *reaſons* of my contrary *aſſertion* §. 11. &c. which being certainly as yet not *anſwered*, or ſo much as taken *notice* of in this place, I wonder I ſhould be again ſo ſoon accuſed of *petitio principii*, *begging the quaſtion without proof*.

20. As for my *preſumption* in mentioning, (for I did no more) the ἄ πνα for ἄλινα, I deſire his *pardon*, for truely I did not expect it ſhould be ſo *faſtidiouſly* caſt off (the uſe of it being as *fit* for *his* rendring, πνὰ λόγον *ſome ſhew*, as for *mine*, πνὰ λόγον *quandam rationem*) or that the bare taking notice of it as *poſſible*, not *preſuming* it as *certain*, or offering it ſo much as my *conjecture*, ſhould ſo ſeriouſly have *provoked* him; As it is, the *advantages* are ſo ſlender which I aimed at by it, that I ſhall very contentedly lay it aſide, and no farther ſollicite his *patience* for it, though tis ſure enough that many more conſiderable changes have by *ſober* men been propoſed in *explicating* that Book.

21. As for the ὦν, *quidem*, *indeed*, for which I am *charged* that I *leave it out* (though if I did, what greater fault have I committed, then St *Hierome* had done, who, ſaith the *Diatribiſt*, *thinks the particle* ὦν *is redundant?* yet) I gueſſe not upon what grounds it ſhould be affirmed, when it is viſible in the beginning of §. 7. that I keep it in, and by what hath now been ſaid, that it is *mine*, not *his* intereſt to *keep* it in; All the appearance he can have for thus *affirming* is, that in propoſing that reading of ἄ πνα in *two* words, I ſet it down thus, ἄ πνα ἐστὶν ἔχοντα λόγον--but as there I leave out ὦν, ſo I leave out σοφίας and all the reſt of the *verſe*, and onely ſet down ſo many words as are ſufficient to *expreſs* what I mean by *dividing* ἄ πνα into *two* words, without any thought (if I may be believed) of *leaving* out ὦν or ſeeking any *advantage* by ſo doing, or of ought elſe then what I now declare to have been *deſigned* by me.

22. But for the particle δὲ *adversative*, which he next considers, I professe not to *divine* his meaning, there being no such particle in the verse, as far as any of my *copies* or my *eyes* can direct me.

Sect. 8.

The abstinences how taught by the Gnosticks. Their pretenses for them, no realities. Abstinences may be freewill offerings, and self-denyals. Such may Fasting duely qualified. Such may virginal Chastity. Pauls *judgement of it.* Chrysostome *of things* ὑπὲρ ἐντολὴν. *Abstinences positive acts. And yet, if negative, may be acceptable. These abstinences not commanded.*

Numb. 1. TO his 8th and 9th §§. there is little for me to *reply*, which hath not been cleared sufficiently already; Onely in the end of the 9th he saith there is *a great mistake in comprehending these abstinences under freewill offerings*; *for*, saith he, *both the freewill offerings were something positive, and these abstinences were negative, rather not offering then offering, touch not, taste not &c. and all these abstinences were commanded by speciall Laws, but freewill offerings, the Doctor saith, were not required of them by obligation of particular Law.*

2. Of this my supposed *mistake*, I must give some account, thus, The *abstinences* here spoken of I suppose to be of *two* sorts, from *meats*, and from *marriage*, both which were now perfectly *lawfull* to be freely used *sine discrimine*, by *Christians*; Those therefore that taught them to lie now under *interdict*, were *dogmatizers* and *false teachers*; This therefore was a great fault in them, contrary to the clear *Christian* doctrine of *liberty* from *Judaical observances*, (of which sort were those *abstinences* from *meats*) and of the *honourableness* of *mariage* among all, when the *Gnostick* detesters of *mariage*, making it *damnable*, and the *abstinence* necessary to *salvation* (and so in the words of the *Apostolick Canon*, abstained and taught that *abstinence* οὐ δι' ἄσκησιν ἀλλὰ διὰ ἐδολυρίαν, *not as an exercise, but out*

of

of deteſtation of marriage) brought in all the *ἀτιμια παθη diſhonorable, vile affections*, and practiſes in ſtead of it.

3. This *double* error being noted and cenſured by the *Apoſtle*, he yet ſhewes the *pretenſes*, whereby it was recommended by the *falſe teachers*, to thoſe *ſeducible* perſons corrupted by them, *viz*: that theſe *abſtinencies* were acts of *voluntary worſhip* and *ſelf-denial*, and ſo could not fail to be *acceptable* to *God*. That they were *truly* ſuch, I never imagined, but that they *pretended* to be ſuch, had ſome ſhew at leaſt of *piety* in theſe two *reſpects*, pretending on one ſide to *voluntary worſhip*, on the other to *ſelf-denial*, but then had *really* no more of theſe, then of the *piety* which they *pretended* to have; If they had the leaſt degree of *piety* in them (reading τινὰ λόγον σοφίας, and rendring it *quandam rationem ſomewhat of wiſdom* or *piety*) then that was in this reſpect, that there was ſomewhat of *voluntary oblation* and *ſelf-denial* in them; If they had *not* the leaſt *reality*, but only a *ſhew*, (and τινὰ λόγον *ſome ſhew* agrees as commodiouſly to that) then ſtill that *ſhew* was in theſe *two* reſpects, that they had alſo a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip* or *voluntary oblation*, and of *ſelf-denial*. And ſo ſtill I am free enough from any *neceſſity* of acknowledging his *charge* of comprehending *abſtinencies* under *freewill-offerings*, when I only affirm that they were *recommended* by *falſe teachers* under thoſe *ſpecious colors*.

4. Yet now *ex abundanti*, and to gratifie the *Diatribiſt*, by throwing a μῆλον ῥιπτῶ before him, I ſhall not doubt to *affirm*, that ſuch the *abſtinencies* may be, and ſo they may be recommended by the *Orthodox Church* (which is far enough from theſe foul *Gnoſticks*) that they may very ſafely and fitly be comprehended under the head either of *freewill-offerings* or *Self-denials*. Of the latter there can be no doubt, for *faſting* and *virginal chaſtity* are certainly acts of *Self-denial*, *denying* our ſelves the *enjoyment* of thoſe *ſatisfactions*, which might moſt *lawfully* be enjoyed: And if to this of *Self-denial* be farther added the deſigning of this to the *honor* or *ſervice* of *God*, *faſting* in order to *Chriſtian* ends, either as an outward effect and *expreſſion* of *Godly ſorrow*, or as an inſtrument of *bringing the body into ſubjection*, fitting my ſelf for more *leiſure* and *ardor* in *prayer*, acting *revenge* upon my ſelf for the *intemperancies* of the former life, and, as to the very *Self-*

denial, looking on it as that which will be *acceptable* to *God*, though not (to every possible act) *commanded*, *sub periculo animæ*, and as such *dedicating* it to *God*, this sure will be a נדבה or *voluntary freewill-offerings*, and so properly comprehended under that head.

5. And the same is as visible of *virginal chastity*, which is no where *commanded* by *Christ* or his *Apostles* to any, but yet *recommended* to them which are able to *bear* it, *he that can receive it, let him receive it*, and the advantages of it, under the title of τὸ συμφέρον *profitable*, 1 Cor: 7. 35. set out by S. *Paul* in order to the *advancing* of some *Christian* ends, *purity* of *body* and *Spirit*, *caring* for, or *minding* more *intently* the *things of the Lord*, being *without solicitude*, in times of *distresse*, when the *cares* of the *world* may very much *incumber* all, and probably *insnare* many; Upon which grounds the *Apostle*, that out of his fatherly care would have them aspire to the *greatest perfection*, and so wishes them this ἀμεριμνία, doth also professe it his judgement, that he that thus *abstains* from *marriage* doth *better*, even when he that *marrieth doth well*, and consequently proposes this whole matter not as ἐπιταγὴν κυείν any *command* of *Christs*, for he professeth to have *no* such, but as his *opinion* or *judgement* v. 25. and 40. which what is it but the very notion of *freewill-offering*, such as of

Tom. 3. p. 382. which S. *Chrysostome* saith, Τὸ δὲ ἐμῆς προαιρέσεως κατόρθωμα, *it is an act of my own will*, in opposition to the τὸ μὲν εἶναι ἐπίταγμα, *a precept*, or *command*, *precedent*, or ἃ μὲν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐντολὴν γίνεται, πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν μισθὸν καὶ τοῦτο, ἃ δὲ ἐν ἐντολῆς τάξει ὑποπίπτον, *Those things which are done above the precept, have in this respect great reward, but those which are in the rank of precept, not so much.*

6. As for the reasons produced by the *Diatribist*, certainly they will be of no force against this *evidence*; for why may not *virginity*, or *fasting* deserve to be accounted *positive* things? is it not as truly a *positive* action to *conquer* as to *satisfie*, to *subdue* as to *glut* my *appetite*? and if *self-denials* be *negative* things, and yet *acceptable* to *Christ*, what prejudice will it be to these *abstinencies*, though they should be deemed *negative* also? Are not all the *obediences* that are performed to *negative precepts*, compliances with those *negations*, and so *negative* also, as *not killing*, *not committing*

ting adultery &c. And ſhall not the ſame be ſaid of all abſtinences? If *Adam* had *not taſted the forbidden fruit*, this had been but *negative*, yet an *act* of *obedience* to *God*, and that preferred by *God* before *all burnt-offerings* and *ſacrifices*, *preſcribed*, or *voluntary*, And then what *diminution* could it be to an *abſtinence*, or *prejudice* to its being a *freewill-offering*, that it is a *negative act*? So wide is this kinde of *arguing* from proving any thing.

7. And as wide is his ſecond proof, that theſe *abſtinencies* were *commanded by ſpecial lawes*, when he knows that *abſtinence* from *marriage* was never *commanded* by any *law* of *Moſes*, or *Chriſt*, and that that other from *meats* was now left *free* by *Chriſt*, thoſe *ſpecial laws* under *Moſes* given to the *Jewes* being now *caſſate* and *cancelled* by *Chriſt*. This ſure is enough to his *preſent velitations*, what he hath of *reſerve* for a *weightier impreſſion*, ſhall then be *warded* when I ſee it *approach*, and therefore ſo much for theſe two *Sections*.

Sect. 9.

Compliance with Papiſts. The Diatribiſts inconſtancy.

1. HIS 10th §. being an introduction to his ſurvey of my ſix reaſons for the taking *Will-worſhip Col:* 2. in a *good creditable ſenſe*, begins with a *general*, but that poſing, confounding note, that *taking the word in a good ſenſe, the Doctor complies too much with the Papiſts* (*moſt of them taking it in an ill*) *who uſe to take off the force of the Proteſtants objection from this place againſt their Will-worſhip, by anſwering, that it is taken here in a good ſenſe, for voluntary religion or worſhip*] To which I confeſſe my ſelf unable to give any *anſwer*, as not gueſſing wherein the *objection* lies, whether in my *complying*, or *not complying* with the *Papiſts*. *Numb.* 1.

2. The words expreſſely tell me, that *taking it in a good ſenſe I comply with the Papiſts*, and yet there are other words as expreſſely pronouncing, that *moſt of the Papiſts take it in an ill ſenſe*: The only expedient to me imaginable to *reconcile* theſe *contradictions*

(which yet I have no pretence of imputing to the *Printer*, or to any but the *Author*) is this, that though *most of the Papists take it in an ill sense* yet *some* though *smaller* number of them take it in a *good*, and so *defend their many traditions of worship* (as he calls them) *and answer the Protestants objections* (the *Diatribists* and his partners) *from that text*, *Col*: 2. and then that I differ from those *Protestants*, and *comply* with those *Papists*.

3. And if this be the meaning, then as 1. I can truly say, that I borrowed not this *interpretation* of that *word* or *text* from any *Popish* writer, but from the weighing the *text* it self, and the *characters* I found in it (the same that *Hugo Grotius* hath discerned also, as was said) and accordingly set those down for the *reasons* of my *interpretation*; so if I shall truly be found to have *complied* with any *Papist* herein, yet 1. I shall never startle at the *interpretation*, upon that account, many *Papists* having given the *true* senses of many places of *Scripture*; and 2. I shall with much more *justice* be able to *retort* this argument on the *Diatribist* if I may *believe* himself, the sense which he hath given, *viz*: the *ill* sense, being *owned* by most of the *Papists*, as he here himself confesses. And then sure he that is *acknowledged* to *comply* with most of the *Papists*, and not he which is but *accused* to *comply* with *some few* of them, must needs be most guilty of that *crime*, whatsoever 'tis fancied to be, which consists in such *compliance*.

4. Nay 'tis not long since he affirmed of my *interpretation* of this
Diatr. p. 44. *verse*, that he *believes it is singular without any precedent, either ancient or modern, Protestant or Papist*, and then I have little reason to believe his bare *general* suggestion against his own *belief*, that the *Doctor* herein *complies with the Papists*, especially when out of *Chamier*, he here addes that that *learned and acute man*, *Panstrat*: l. 3. c. 6. §. 5. *professes he never saw the good sense in any interpreter of the place*.

5. So then this *general* note is not likely to tend much to our prejudice, I proceed then to his more particular answer to my reasons.

Sect. 10.

Sect. 10.

A reply to his anſwer of my two firſt reaſons for the good ſenſe. Humility and Will-worſhip aſſociated, either both real or both pretended. Popiſh laniations why culpable. Σωματικὴ γυμνασία 1 Tim. 4. πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, ὲυ ὀλίγῳ, ἐπ' ὀλίγον. *Faſting a* Λατρεία *far from hurtful or abominable, wherein the profit of it conſiſts. The true ſenſe of* 1 Tim. 4. 8. *wherein the ilneſſe of it conſiſts.* Ἄσκησις *and* βδελυρία. *Abſtinence becauſe of abuſes. For Religion. Marcionites. Durand. A ſhew of Piety in Will-worſhip. All ſhew of good in reſpect of ſomewhat that is good. The Diatribiſts fallacious inſtances and queſtions.*

AND my *firſt reaſon* being taken from the *joining* of *Wil-worſhip with humility*, one *undoubted Chriſtian* virtue, *and not ſparing*, or, as *Calvin*, *mortifying of the body*, To the former his *anſwer* is, that *by my favour humility here is not the true and laudable Chriſtian virtue, but a meer counterfeit, a pretended humility fit for a pretended Will-worſhip.*

1. And I reply, that if it be ſo, it fits my turn very *well*, for ſtill *Will-worſhip* and *humility* are *aſſociated*, the *pretended Will-worſhip*, he ſaith, with the pretended *humility*, and conſequently that as the fault is not in the *humility*, but in the *pretending* of it, when it is not *true*, the *falſeneſſe* and *counterfeitneſſe* of it, and that an *evidence* that the *humility*, if it were *truly* ſuch, were a *Chriſtian virtue*, becauſe the *fault* is in the *feignedneſſe* of it; ſo by the *analogy* of reaſon, it muſt hold of *Will-worſhip*, that when that is *truly ſuch*, it is a *Chriſtian* virtue, and that the only *fault* is, that it is not what it *pretends* to be, and ſo that is ſtill a *valid* argument for the good ſenſe of the *word*, *Will-worſhip*, thoughnot of the *diſguiſe* and *falſe appearance* of it, the bare *ſhew* even of *divine worſhip* it ſelf being acknowledged to have nothing of *good* in it, which yet certainly the *reality* of it hath.

2 As for that of the *Self-denial*, *it is*, ſaith he, *not only a counterfeit, but an impious miſtaken mortification*, viz: *when tis made*

a worship of God, and he instances in the *Romish ridiculous Penances, Pilgrimages, &c.* and asks *what tis that makes them impious mistaken mortification, not their being held forth as commands of God, for that they deny, it must be then*, saith he, *because they make them worships of God, voluntary worship*] Here again the *former* reply is in force, if it be the *counterfeitnesse* and *impiety* of the *mortification* that *defames* it, then still the *self-denial* and *mortification, truly* so called, is a *Christian virtue*, and then that will conclude the *Will-worship* to be so too, if it be *truly* what it *pretends* to be.

4. As for his instance, and *question* founded on it, it *answers* it self, for as it is not their *holding it forth as the command of God*, so neither is it their *making it the worship of God*, that renders it *culpable*, but the *ridiculousnes* of it which he mentions, the *unfitnes* or *inordinableness* to that end, to which it is designed; such *laniations* of our *own* bodies being on that account, and by their *affinity* to the *bloody sacrifices* under the *Law*, deprived of all *appearance* of being *acceptable* to *God*, and so for all other sorts, which are not either *regular effects* of *Godly sorrow*, or designed as *expedients* to make it ἀμεταμέλητον μετάνοια a *lasting* and *durable repentance* (as ἐκδίκησις *revenge*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. is defined to be) For whatsoever is truly so, I must not be so injurious to it, as to doubt of the *acceptation* with *God*, or to censure it either as *impious* or *ridiculous*.

5. My 2d. *reason* for the taking *Will-worship* in a *good* sense, was this, because these *abstinences are said to have* λόγον σοφίας, *whether that be some small reality, or else a bare shew of wisdome in respect of the Will-worship discernible in them, neither of which they could be said to have, if Will-worship had past with* St Paul for *foolish or impious, for how can a thing be said to have so much as a shew of piety in respect to any sin, as lust, or rage, discernible in it?* To this his *answer* is *long* and *perplext*, 1. By rejecting that notion of λόγον σοφίας for any *degree* of *real wisdome*; And to this I that did not really adhere to that, will not be so far concerned in it, as to make any reply or at all to indevour to *defend* it, or to adde of it farther then this, that the bare *possibility* that it might so signifie, *supersedes* all *demonstrativeness* of proof from this *text*, for the *criminousness* of *Will-worship*.

But

6. But upon this occasion he takes liberty to consider the *Apostles* words of *bodily exercise*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. and of that affirmes when it is said to be πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος *profitable for a little, the meaning is, tis profitable for nothing, nay hurtfull and abominable.*

7. To this παρέργον I must interpose, that this is a very strange and *groundless* interpretation of πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος *profitable for a little*, i.e. for *nothing*, and even less then so, *hurtfull* and *abominable.* It is, as if when *Agrippa* tells *Paul* ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι, *a little way thou perswadest me to be a Christian*, he should interpret it, that *Agrippa* was *not at all* perswaded by him toward *Christianity*, but on the *other* side was more *confirmed* in his *Gentilisme.*

8. To this purpose it is observable, that although the *bodily exercise* in that *text* be by some of the *antients* understood of *bodily labour*, yet they which do so, render πρὸς ὀλίγον so, as to signifie *somewhat*, ὀλίγον ὠφέλησε τὸ σῶμα καὶ πρὸς καιρὸν, *it profits the body a little and for a while*, saith St *Chrysostome* and *Theophylact*, (and so we know it doth) and S. *Hierome* in like manner, *ad breve tempus in carnali proficiunt sanitate, they are for a short time profitable in respect of bodily health*, and so likewise those others of the *Antients*, *Ambrose &c.* who understand it of *fasting*, (so doth *Leo* also *Serm: de jejun: 7. mensis*, sometimes in that phrase of *corporum labor, the labor of bodies, Serm:* 2. sometimes of *exercitatio continentiæ, quam sibi quisque proprio arbitrio indicit, the exercise of abstinence which every one by his own choice layes on himself, Serm:* 3.) conceive πρὸς ὀλίγον to denote *some degree* of *profit, utilitatem cujusdam portionis*, saith *Leo*, though not so great as belongs to that which is understood by *piety* in the next words.

9. Thus the phrase מצט יסכן signifies among the *Rabbins* that which is in *some* degree *profitable*, but within certain *bounds*, and so also among the *Greeks*, as when *Plato* saith of *Socrates*, Σωκράτους ἐπ' ὀλίγον φροντιστέον, ἀληθείας ἐπὶ πολὺ, *Socrates is a little to be considered, but truth a great deal*, and proportionably here the *comparison* lyes, *bodily exercise is profitable for a little, but godliness is profitable for all things.*

10. As for his *censure*, that by *consequence* to this interpretation, he fastens on *bodily exercise*, in this notion, taking it for *abstinences* from *meats* and *mariage*, without relation to that of the *Dogmatizers teaching* and requiring that *abstinence* as from things *forbidden* by *God*, i. e. (in effect) on bare *voluntary fasting* and *celibacie* (when they are onely used πρὸς ἄσκησιν, *for exercise*, ἀ πρὸς βδελυρίαν *not with detestation* of *mariage* or *meats*, as the *antient Canons* have it) viz. that they are *hurtfull* and *abominable* [I need say no more, but that it is an *ungrounded* and *unwary affirmation*, no way to be justified or *excused* unless still he relieve himself at the dead lift with the *supposition*, that they are made the *worship* of *God*.]

11. And then again as that cannot be applied to *abstinence* from *mariage*, in his notion of *worship* (for even they that make that a thing *acceptable* to *God*, and a state of *perfection*, do not count it a *worship*, unless in a *generall* sense, as every *virtuous act* performed to *God*, may be styled *worship*, and so this, being not under *precept*, but *commended*, a *Will-worship*) so being applied to *abstinence* from *meats*, it can be of no very good *consequence*.

12. For *Fasting* hath long been numbred among the sorts of *Christian sacrifice*, and is so set down by * *Aquinas* from that of S. *Paul* of *offering up our bodyes a sacrifice to God*, *Rom.* 12. which, saith he, is done by *fasting*, *continence*, *martyrtome*; *Leo* calls it *continentiæ libamen*, the *sacrifice of abstinence*. And * St *Hierome* speaking of it, useth this style, *quicquid supra justitiam offertur Deo*, making it an *offering* to *God*, though not under *precept*, and before him * *Tertullian*, speaking of *abstinence*, *Humilitatem animæ Deo immolant*, *they sacrifice to God the humility of the soul*. And li: *de Resurr: Carn: c.* 8. *Sacrificia Deo grata, conflictationes dico animæ, jejunia, & feras & aridas escas*, *fasting a sacrifice acceptable to God*. And yet higher, it is the expresse saying of St *Luke* concerning *Anne*, that she did λατρεύειν *serve God in fastings and prayers*, *Luke* 2. 37. And agreeable to this it is, that our *Saviour* mentions it together with *prayer* and *almesgiving*, *Mat.* 6. and promiseth it a *reward*, v. 18.

* 2^a 2^æ *qu.* 85. *art.* 3.

* *Ad Celantiam Ep.* 14. *Tom.* 1. *p.* 31.

* *De cultu fœm. c.* 9.

13. That the other two are *species* of *worship*, and the *solemne Christian sacrifices*, so styled by the holy *writers*, there is no question;

question; and then why, or how should *Fasting* which is the *third*, if it be *qualified* as it ought, be degraded from the *honor*, and for no other *crime*, but only for being taught to be what really it is, i. e. an *acceptable worship* of *God*, become *hurtfull* and *abominable?*

14. By the way, would this be affirmed by the *Diatribist* of *hearing Sermons*, in case it should be *taught*, or *assume* to be a *part* of *God's worship?* would it presently be cast out as *hurtfull* and *abominable?* And yet sure bare *hearing* of *Sermons* is not any acknowleged branch of *worship*.

15. Something, I acknowledge, of *difference* there is, betwixt this of *Fasting* and those other two of *Prayer* and *Almesgiving*, to which *Christ* annexeth it; *Fasting* receives the chief of its *virtue* and *estimation*, not from the act it self, which is but a *self-denial*, but either as an *effect* of *piety*, as flowing from *godly sorrow*, and so joined with [a] *prayer* for *pardon*, or as an [b] *help* or *expedient* toward *piety*, whether by *subduing* of *carnal desires*, by [c] *humbling* the *soul* &c. or by *fitting* and *gaining* us *leasure* and *ability* for [d] *prayer*, and *for* [e] *almesgiving*; and if it be the bare *abstinence* from *meat* abstracted from all of these, it is [f] no such *eminent* or *acceptable worship* of *God*, *Hæc enim virtus adjumentum est, non perfectio sanctitatis, this virtue is an help, not the perfection of sanctity*, saith [g] S. *Hierom, ad Celantiam*; But then still such a *help* it is, and that to more ends then one; For speaking of *Chastity*, he addes, *non huic tantummodo, sed omnibus omninovirtutibus abstinentia opitulatur, fasting is helpful not to that only, but generally to all virtues*, And so S. *Chrysostome* φάρμακον ἐστὶν ἡ νηστεία, *fasting is a medicine*, but that *useless*, if it be not used as it should be,

[a] *Afflictio corporis peccatorum indulgentiam deprecatur: Hierom: in Isa: 58. Tom: 4. p. 191. F.* [b] πάντων δὲ τούτων ὑπόθεσις ἡμῖν ἡ νηστεία καὶ διδάσκαλος ἔσται. *Chrysost: Ανδριαντ: γ. Tom: 6. p. 476. l. 17.* [c] *Eò affligunt carnem suam, quo animæ frangant superbiam. Hieron: ad Celantiam Ep: 14. Tom: 1 p. 39. 8.* [d] *Eodem tempore vacemus orationi, ne interior homo noster Diaconis vescatur carnibus. Hieron: in Isa: 58.* οὐδὲν ὄφελος τῆς νηστείας ἡμῖν ἂν παρελθῶμεν αὐτὴν ἁπλῶς εἰκῇ, ματὴν, *Chrysost: Ανδριαντ: 15. Tom: 6. p. 573. l. 16.* [e] *Frange panem esurienti, partem panis quam si non jejunares comesturus eras. Jejunium tuum non sit lucrum marsupii, sed saturitas animæ. Hieron: Ib: Tom: 4. p. 191. G. Quod vestris usibus religiosâ parcitate subtrahitis, in alimoniam pauperum, & in cibos debilium transferatis. Leo de Jejun: 7. mens: Serm: 4.* [f] νηστείας ὄφελος οὐδὲν, ἂν μὴ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἕπηται πάντα, *Chrysost: Ανδριαντ. γ. To. 6. p. 476. l. 25.* [g] *Hier: Tom: 1. Ep: 14. p. 39. A.*

16. So that ſtill looking on it but as ſuch, it is I hope more capable of the titles of *uſeful* and *profitable* for *ſomewhat*, then of *hurtful* and *abominable*; As it is an *inſtrument* of *good*, a *help*, or *medicine*, ſo ſure 'tis *profitable εἰς ὀλίγον*, in ſome *lower* degree, in order to thoſe *uſes*; And what if by our *faults*, διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν ἢ κακίαν, ſaith * *Chryſoſtome*, *becauſe of the unſkilfulneſſe of thoſe that uſe it*, it become ἄχρηστον *uſeleſs*, yet ſure this is no *defamation* or *prejudice* to it; The moſt *generous medicaments* may thus be rendred *uſeleſſe* and *inoperative*, yet are in themſelves very apt to work *cures*, and ſo *prayer* it ſelf may become utterly *unprofitable*, by the like *miſcarriage* of ours, And more eſpecially *hearing* the *word*, which is very proper for *excellent uſes*, for *inſtruction*, *admonition* &c. doth yet in the *event* very frequently prove *unprofitable*, and yet this is no *prejudice* to the *inſtitution*.

17. By this I ſuppoſe, the *exact* importance of the *phraſe* may be collected, as *bodily exerciſe* is not *cpp oſed* to, but *compared* with *godlineſſe*, and [*profitable πρὸς ὀλίγον, for a little*] to [*πρὸς πάντα, for all things, having the promiſe of this life*, &c.] *viz.* that ſuch *exerciſes* as theſe, *faſting* particularly, is a very good *inſtrument* in a *pious* mans handling, *profitable* and *advantageous* in its degree, in order to *mortification* &c. to teſtifie our *ſorrow* and *repentance*, to *aſſiſt* in the *deprecating* of *Gods* wrath, to qualifie us for *relieving* of others, for *ardent intenſe prayer*, &c. but yet muſt not be magnified above its *proportion*, being compared with *univerſal piety*, which is *profitable to all things*, and *hath the promiſe of this life and of another*. This falls very low in that high compariſon, it is but πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, *profitable for a little*, whether in *extent* of *matter*, *profitable* for *fewer* things then *piety*, which is *profitable* for *all* things; or in *extent* of *time*, as πρὸς ὀλίγον ſometimes is rendred, πρὸς καιρὸν *profitable for this time* of *life* wherein all thoſe *benefits* are to be reapt, to which *faſting* is *profitable*, *humiliation*, *mortification* &c. but eſpecially in the former *notion* of this *extent*, *profitable* for *ſome few* things, in compariſon. And ſo much *ex abundanti* for the vindicating that *text* of the *profitableneſſe* of *bodily exerciſe*.

18. Before he leaves this, he addes that the *Doctor ſeems to place the illneſſe of theſe bodily exerciſes in this*, *when they are taught*

taught as necessary, to the defaming of meat and marriage; But—— I *answer,*

19. That I did so place their *ilnesse*, I thought I had done it on very *good authority*, that of the *ancient Canons*, particularly of the 51 *Apostolical*, εἴτις ἐπίσκοπος γάμου καὶ κρεῶν καὶ οἴνου, οὐ δι' ἄσκησιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ βδελυρίαν, ἀπέχεται, ἐπιλαθόμενος ὅτι πάντα καλὰ λίαν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς. ἀλλὰ βλασφημῶν διαβάλλει τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἢ διορθούσθω, ἢ καθαιρείσθω &c. *If any Bishop or Clerk abstain from marriage, flesh, wine, not for exercise, (abstinence* or *continence) but for detestation, he forgets that God created all things very good, male and female* &c. *and blasphemously calumiates the creation, and therefore must either reform or be deposed.* Tis visible here wherein that *fault* consists, not in the *abstinence*, but looking on *meats* and *marriage* as *unlawful* things, which they could not be, but as they are supposed to be *forbidden* by *God*, And *Zonaras*'s comment on it is very *natural*, τὸ μὲν δι' ἐγκράτειαν ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀποδεκτέον, *Abstinence* for the virtues sake is to be *allowed* and *commended*. τὸ δὲ ταῦτα βδελύττεσθαι καὶ ὡς βλαβερὰ πρὸς ψυχὴν ἀποσείεσθαι, οὐκ ἀνέγκλητον, *but abominating those and rejecting them as hurtful to the soul*, this is it which is *criminous* and *censurable*. And *Balsamon* addes, that as they shall be *censured* which *abstain* from them διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι παραίτια κακοῦ τοῖς κακῶς παραχρωμένοις αὐτοῖς, *because they are causes of ill to those that abuse them*, instancing in *Bogomilus* which did so; so he that abstains διὰ εὐλάβειαν *for religion* or *piety*, οὐ κατακριθήσεται *shall not be censured*. As cautious a *prevention* of this *Diatribists doctrine*, and as seasonable an advertisement to him, as could have been imagined.

20. To these *testimonies* I might farther adde that of *Tertullian*, who affirms that among the followers of *Marcion* and *Tatianus* (though not, saith he, of *Montanus*) were found men *qui perpetuam abstinentiam præcipiunt ad destruenda & dejicienda opera creatoris, who commanded perpetual abstinence to the destroying and casting down the works of the Creator, de jejun:* c. 15. And the like intimations of the *opinion* of *hereticks* we meet frequently in the *Fathers*, who give their *cautions* against this, *Non reiciendis generibus ciborum quasi pollutis. August: de mor: Eccl: Cath:* l.1.c.33. *& escarum non naturas sed concupiscentias damnent,*

nunt. Prosper de vit: contempl. l. 2. c. 22. And many the like. And among the *Papists* no meaner person then *Durand* speaks much to this sense, that those old *hereticks* did, (though the generality of the *Papists* seem not to *approve* or *follow* him) *God*, saith he, *cursed the earth, and from thence it is that in fasting 'tis unlawful to eat any flesh that is upon the earth, beasts and birds*, &c. *Rat. divin. Off.* l. 6. c. 7. But this by the way.

21. Next then taking the words λόγ & σοφίας to signify only a *shew* of *piety*, he cannot but *wonder* at my *question* [*How abstinences can have so much as a shew of piety in Will-worship, if Will-worship passe confestly for foolish and impious?*] bidding me *ask all interpreters, who render the words, a shew of wisdom in superstition or affected religion, how this can be.*

22. But before I shall *ask* them, I must have some assurance from this *Diatribist*, that all *interpreters* do so render it, for otherwise my *question* will be lost in the *aire*, and never bring me home any *answer*; But of this I am well enough advised, that all *interpreters* do not thus render it, I shall instance, as even now I did, in the learned *Grotius*, as valuable, I believe, as any that will be brought for the *Diatribist*'s interpretation, and besides, any *one* asserter of *mine* interpretation (and certainly *Grotius* is *one*) confutes his *assertion* of *all interpreters*.

23. However, unlesse I can be farther assured, that he or they whom the *Diatribist* takes for *all*, doth also take *notice* of, and render some *answer* to my *question*, what shall I gain by *asking* them? And if they do *answer it*, why would not the *Diatribist* be so kinde as to recite it from them? But this I am sure he hath not done, by asking me again, *Cannot a thing have a shew of wisdom or piety, which is confessedly foolish or impious, and if so, may it not be so in respect of the Will-worship in it?*

24. I *answer*, that if I take the *question* in the *terms* wherein it is proposed, it is no way of *answering* my *question*, but the diverting to a very *distant* matter, For when he asks, *may it not be so in respect of the Will-worship in it?* the plain importance of his words is, *may it not be foolish or impious in respect of the Will-worship that is in it?* not, *may it not have a shew of wisdom or piety in respect of the Will-worship?* for it is visible that [*be so*] referres to [*is foolish*] and not to [*have a shew*] And then there is

a

a faire *fallacie* put upon the Reader, the *termes* of my *queſtion*, and of the *text*, quite changed, and others ſubſtituted in ſtead of them, and then I confeſs that ſuppoſing *Will-worſhip* as *ill*, as the *Diatribiſt* would have it, a thing may be *fooliſh* or *impious* in reſpect of *Will-worſhip*.

25. But let the *queſtion* be fairely ſet, *cannot a thing that is fooliſh and impious have a ſhew of wiſdome in reſpect of Will-worſhip?* And then as I ſhall anſwer, it may: ſo I muſt adde, that then that *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good* ſenſe, for elſe that *fooliſh* thing could not have a *ſhew of wiſdome* or *piety in Will-worſhip*. If a *fool* have any *ſhew* of *wiſdome* in him, it muſt be ſure not in *reſpect* of his *folly*, but of ſome *particular* or other, which is by him that ſpeaks accounted *wiſdome*, and that he muſt have in him either in *reality* or in *appearance*, or elſe how can he have any *ſhew* of *wiſdome*? If *Satan* have the *ſhew* or *appearance* of an *Angel of light*, it muſt be in *reſpect* to ſomething which he doth, or pretends to do, which is *Angelical*.

26. As for the *inſtances* with which he proſecutes this, it muſt be a ſtrange *ſhortneſs* of *diſcourſe*, if he can think they *evince* his *concluſion*; He *exemplifies* in the *Baalitical lancing*, and the *Popiſh penances*, and ſuppoſing the former *impious*, and the latter not onely *ridiculous* but *heatheniſh*, yet *theſe*, ſaith he, *had a ſhew of piety*. But what if they had, was it ever denyed or *queſtioned* by me, but that *impious perſons* or *actions* might have a *ſhew* of *piety*? for ſure I always knew there were *hypocrites* in the world, but my *queſtion* he knows was, how any thing can have a *ſhew* of *piety* in reſpect of that very thing which is *impious*? This was the onely queſtion that belonged to the affair betwixt us, and certainly the *Diatribiſt's* inſtances are very remote from that, for the *Baalites ſhew* of *piety* conſiſted not in their *bloody lancing* of themſelves, nor the *Papiſts* in their as *bloody penances*, but either in the *reality* or *appearance* of that *deteſtation* of *ſinne*, and that *zeal*, which make them ſubmit themſelves to ſo much *ſmart*.

27. It was very neceſſary then for him in the purſuite of this, when he again recites my queſtion, [*But (ſaith the Doctor) can any thing be repreſented to me as having ſo much as a ſhew of piety, in reſpect of luſt or rage diſcernible in it?*] to tell the *Reader* that this *compariſon* is ill *laid*. For if this be well laid, then ſure his

his ſetting of the *queſtion* is fouly out of the way. But why is it *ill laid*? is it not directly a way of *tryall*, whether *will-worſhip* be ſet by the *Apoſtle* in an *ill* notion? For if it be, then ſomewhat elſe which is acknowledgedly *ill* (and θύμος and ὀργὴ *rage* and *luſt*, the two *principles* of *ſenſuality*, were the fitteſt I could think on of this ſort, to inſtance in) being put in the ſtead of it, the *Apoſtles* words would ſtill continue to have *truth* and congruity in them, *viz.* that ſuch a thing *hath a ſhew of piety in it, in reſpect of luſt or rage.* This it ſeems was too *groſs* for him to ſwallow, and therefore (and upon no other reaſon, but becauſe it made the truth moſt *palpable*) the *compariſon*, ſaith he, was *ill laid*.

28. But 'tis yet more *ſtrange*, if we conſider his *reaſon* of *excepting* againſt this *compariſon*, *For rage*, ſaith he, *and luſt are for kind confeſſedly wicked things.* (And truly that was the reaſon why I inſtanced in them, to ſhew that a thing cannot have a *ſhew* of *good* in reſpect of that which is *confeſſedly bad*, which I could not have ſhewed in thoſe *inſtances*, if they might have been *good* as well as *bad*) *but worſhip*, ſaith he, *may be true or falſe.* I ſhall then onely ask, whether *Will-worſhip* may ſo too? for that, he knows, is the word we contend about.

29. If it may *not*, but is always *falſe*, then ſtill it is directly parallel to *luſt* and *rage*, in this, wherein the *compariſon* was made, *thoſe* always *ill*, and *this* alſo: But if *Will-worſhip* may be *true*, as well as *falſe*, then as I acknowledge a thing may have a *ſhew* of *piety* in reſpect of *Will-worſhip*, meaning the *good* or *true Will-worſhip*, and ſuppoſing S. *Paul* ſo to have meant, and not any *falſe* or *impious will-worſhip*, ſo by this one conceſſion of the *Diatribiſt* after all this *contention* and *ſcrupuloſity* and *niceneſs*, the whole *queſtion* is yielded me, for it ſeems *Will-worſhip may* be *true as* well as *falſe*, and ſo *good* as well as *bad*, and here not confeſſedly *falſe* or *bad*, *quod erat demonſtrandum.*

30. What now follows, ſhewing that *impious and falſe worſhip may have a ſhew of wiſdome and piety to natural men*, is evidently *impertinent* to our debate or *queſtion*, which conſiſts onely in this, whether that which hath a *bare ſhew* of *piety* or *wiſdome*, can have it in reſpect of that which is *confeſſedly impious* and *fooliſh*; and therefore when he hath full ſcope, to *put it a little more home* to me, as he ſaith, and yet can do no more but ask, *Whether zeal may*

not

not have a ſhew of true zeal, and yet be nothing but rage and madneſs? it is ſtill to as little purpoſe, equally *beſide* the *queſtion*; And ſo when he asks, *Whether the Devil transforming himſelf into an Angel of light, muſt have ſomething really of light or piety in him, or elſe cannot have ſo much as a ſhew of piety?* Tis evident he *may*, without having any *reality* of *piety* in him, and yet it is as evident, that if he have that *ſhew* of *piety*, in reſpect of *humility* or *charity*, or any thing elſe, that *humility* or *charity*, or whatſoever elſe, muſt be of the number of thoſe things that are *accounted good* and *pious*, for otherwiſe his having the *appearance* or *bare ſhew* of them would not conclude him to have the *appearance* of *piety*. The matter is *evident* enough, if he will pleaſe to *open* his eyes, I cannot have a *ſhew* of *piety* in *Will-worſhip* unleſs *Will-worſhip* be a *branch* of *piety*, and ſo by proportion a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip* a *ſhew* of *piety*.

31. His concluſion of this copious *anſwer* is yet more obſervable (and according to his directions, I ſhall *note it once* for all) that *the words are not, which things have a ſhew of wiſdome and Will-worſhip &c. for then*, ſaith he, *as wiſdome was good and taken in a good ſenſe, ſo might the reſt be taken, and the fault be, that they had onely an appearance, not the truth or power; but the words are, they have a ſhew of wiſdome in Will-worſhip &c. and if they were faulty becauſe they had onely a ſhew of wiſdome, they will be more faulty that they had but a ſhew of piety, or worſhip, or humility*. All which I ſhall very eaſily *grant*, and as in the *latter* part I ſhall fully *comply* with him, that thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinences*, *Col.* 2. were *faulty*, becauſe though they had a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip* and *humility*, yet they had not the *reality* of thoſe *virtues* in them, ſo from the *former* part of his words I have all reaſon of *analogie* to *conclude*, that *Will-worſhip* is taken in a *good* ſenſe, by its being evidently joyned with *humility* and *ſelf-denyal*, for thoſe ſure are *good* things alſo, as well as *wiſdome*, and that all the *fault* was, that the *doctrines* of *abſtinences* had onely the *appearance* of thoſe *virtues* not the *truth* or *power* of them. How inevitably this *concluſion* is founded on theſe very *premiſes* given me by the *Diatribiſt*, is ſo evident, that I hope I ſhall not need farther to enlarge to ſhew it. By the ſame reaſon that *Will-worſhip* muſt have been concluded *good*, if it had

been joyned with *wisdome*, in this forme [*a shew of wisdome and of Will-worship*] it must certainly follow that *Will-worship* is *good*. because it is *joyned* with *humility* in this forme, [in *Will-worship and humility*] *humility* being as confestly *good*, as wisdome is supposed to be, and the fault of the *abstinential* doctrines still equal, that they had onely the *appearance*, not *reality* of all these.

32. Once more, the utmost force of all is yet *reserved* for the *close* of the *conclusion*, *The words* ἐν ἐθελοθρησκίᾳ &c. saith he, *do no more inforce us to take it in a good sense then when we say, Judas made a shew of love to Christ in his traiterous kiss, and the Papists devotion in bowing to stocks and images.* But I desire that he set the words of his example so, as may be exactly *parallel* to the words *Col.* 2. 23. (the least *change* may have an *influence* on the matter) and then it must be thus, 1. *Judas had* (not *made*) *a shew of love to Christ in his traiterous kiss*, and *the Papists have a shew of devotion in bowing to stocks and images.* And 2. in stead of *traiterous* must be placed some word, which shall no more *vary* the *kiss*, then the addition of *Will* varyes the *worship*, (for that the *uncommandednes* of *worship* makes it *traiterous*, or so much as *ill*, must not be *supposed* here, where it is the onely *question*.)

33. Having *premised* this, I now answer to the *example* as it is by him set, that as the words in the *Apostle* were certainly true, so these words, as they are now *ill* set, are as undoubtedly *false*; for consider the *kiss*, with that so *distinctive* contrary *adjunct*, as a *traiterous kiss*, (which addition as it is *necessary* to make it *ill*, so it deprives it of all *appearance* of *love*) and then *Judas had no shew of love to Christ in this*, viz. in his *traiterous kiss*. If indeed he had said, *Judas had a shew of love to Christ in kissing him*, or *saluting* him friendly, then it had been *true*, and then the *conclusion* had been evident that a *kiss* or *friendly salute* is an *act* or *indication* of *love*, an *hearty kiss* of an *hearty love*, and a *feigned kiss* of a *feigned love*; or if the addition of *traiterous kiss*, had made no greater a *change*, then the addition of *will* or *uncommandednes* to *worship*, then again it had been true; But supposing the *kiss* to be a *traiterous kiss*, viz. a *kiss* given as a *token* or *watchword*, whom (and when) the *Souldiers* should apprehend,

apprehend, then ſure he had no *ſhew of love to Chriſt in that kiſſe*. And ſo in like manner, if the *propoſition* had been, *The Papiſts have a ſhew of devotion in bowing*, it had been true becauſe *adoration* or *bowing* is a *ſpecies* or *indication* of *devotion*, but becauſe *Idolatry* is neither of theſe, and *bowing to ſtocks and images* is *Idolatry*, there can therefore be no truth in that *propoſition*, ſet, as by the *Diatribiſt* it is ſet, and ſuppoſed to be delivered by any *Orthodox* pen (for ſuch ſure was the *Apoſtle's* to his *Coloſſians*) but the direct contradictory will be true and clear to all that count *bowing to ſtocks and images* a *ſin*, For to them the *Papiſts* have no *ſhew* of *devotion* in *bowing to ſtocks or images*, no *ſhew* of *piety*, but only of *impiety* in *Idolatry*.

34. And thus, I hope, I have at length vindicated this 2^d^ *argument* for the *good* ſenſe of the word, from all the evaſions and χρησεύματα (and truly there have been good ſtore of them, and I believe this *Section* his *maſterpiece* of *dexterity*, and therefore I have ſo punctually and κατὰ πόδα inſiſted on it) from all the *ſubtile* refuges of this *Diatribiſt*.

Sect. 11.

The Greek Fathers acception of ἐθελοθρησκεία. *An argument of goodneſs that 'tis pretended by hypocrites. Religion in a good ſenſe. Will-worſhip not worſe then falſe worſhip, not abominable. All deviſed worſhip is not Idolatry, doth not pretend to more wiſdom then Gods. The Latin Fathers cited by* Mr. *C. The vulgar Tranſlator, and the followers thereof.* Δογματίζεσθε *by the vulgar rendred decernitis. The authority of* Bellarmine *and* Daillé *for the good ſenſe. The teſtimonies out of* Ambroſe, Theodoret, Salmeron, Eſtius, Auguſtine, Thomas, *examined.*

1. MY *third reaſon* being taken from the *Greek fathers* underſtanding of the place, who *though they interpret* λόγον *only of appearance, yet paraphraſe Will-worſhip by words of good ſa-*

νουν, εὐλαβὴς *pious*, *religious* &c. The *Diatribist* begins with a *triumph* and *ovation*, *First*, saith he, *this is well that the Greek Fathers agree with us in exposition of the first words, a shew* (*not, as he, somewhat real*) *of wisdom, nay they expresselv oppose against it power and truth, and can that which hath neither power nor truth in the worship of God, be taken in a good sense? And do not the Fathers imply as much, Chrysost:* δοκεῖ δ' εὐλαβὴς τὶς εἶναι &c. οὐκ ὄν, *he seems to be religious, but is not so, Oecumenius* ὑποκρινόμενον εὐλάβειαν, *pretending religion in worship. And is there any goodnesse in hypocrisie?*

2. Here truly it is not to be *reprehended* but *cherished* in the *Diatribist*, that he is so very much *rejoyced* to hear the newes, that the *Greek Fathers* and he are of a minde, in any the least particular, I hope it will *incourage* and ingage him to a more *familiar* conversation with them, and then I am perswaded no body will have reason to repent of it.

3. All that I am to *complain* of at the present, is first that their *interpreting* λόγον a *shew*, should be deemed an *agreement* with *him*, more then with *me*, who he knowes have produced them, and never expresst any *dislike* to that *interpretation*. All the *difference* between us being but this, that the *Greek* λόγον being capable of *two* rendrings, *rationem* and *speciem*, I that desired to proceed on sure grounds, proposed them both, and, which soever should be adhered to, shewed the necessity of θεοσεβὴς being taken in a *good* sense. Tis true indeed, if λόγος should be there taken for *ratio*, the *argument* for the *good* sense would proceed most irresistibly, But supposing it with the *Fathers* to signifie *species*, a *bare shew* or *appearance*, yet the *argument* holds very firmly thus also, the *Gnostick* doctrines cannot have *so much* as a *shew* of *piety* in *Will-worship*, unlesse *Will-worship real* be *piety real*, and the *appearance* of *Will-worship* a foundation of an *appearance* of *piety*. And this being the sense of the *Fathers*, which rendred λόγον a *bare shew*, this sure was fit to be confronted to the *Diatribist*'s pretensions, as a *third argument*.

4. And is it not now a *strange* way of *answer* to this *argument*, to *ask*, as he here doth, *Can that which hath neither power nor truth in the worship of God, be taken in a good sense?* I reply, by demanding what it is, of which the *Fathers* say, that it hath *neither*

ther power nor truth? Sure the *doctrines* of *abſtinence*, and not the *Will-worſhip*? And yet his *anſwer* proceeds as if they ſuppoſed it of the *Will-worſhip*, and without that, hath no *appearance* of force in it. And is not this a ſtrange perverting of plain words? *Chryſoſtome* ſaith, *the falſe teacher ſeems to be pious, but is not*, and *Oecumenius*, that he *ſimulates piety*, and from hence Mr. *C.* concludes that *Will-worſhip is not taken in a good ſenſe.* But I pray is not *piety* taken in a good ſenſe, even when the *hypocrite ſimulates piety*? Nay, would he pretend to it if it were not *good*? Doth a *hypocrite* pretend to that which is acknowledgedly *ill*? This were ſure to *appear* what he is, and that is contrary to his being an *hypocrite*. The product is plain, *Will-worſhip* is rendred by *piety*, not by *appearance* of *piety*, & unleſs *piety* it ſelf can be taken there in an *ill* ſenſe, *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good* ſenſe. Certainly I need adde no more ('tis pity I ſhould be required to ſay ſo much) of this matter.

5. But on occaſion of the *interpreter* of *Clement*, who renders ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, *in religione*, from whence I thought I might conclude it that mans ſenſe, that *Will-worſhip* ſignifies *religion*, and ſo that it was not taken in an *ill* ſenſe, he is pleaſed to ask, [*Why, Is not religion it ſelf of various ſenſes? The ſimple word ſignifies falſe religion, as well as true; but the compoſition makes it worſe, and alters the ſenſe, becauſe it adds the work of mans will to worſhip, which is abominable to God*].

6. What depth there is in this *queſtion* will ſoon appear; For 1. What if both *religio* and θρησκεία be of *various ſenſes*, and *ſignifie falſe religion as well as true, heathen*, or *Judaical*, as well as *Chriſtian*? Is there any appearance of *reaſon* to determine it to the former, in this place, or in that *interpreters* acception of it? If there be, then there is an account of the words being taken in an *ill* ſenſe, without any influence of the ἐθελο, *mans will* upon it; if there be not (as he is obliged to affirm there is not, ſaying p. 69 that the *Apoſtle brands them as deſtructive, becauſe they are but Will-worſhip, not becauſe they are outdated or Judaical*, much leſſe then, becauſe they are any more *dangerous* ſort of *falſe worſhip*, ſuch as was uſed among the *heathens*) then what matters it, what in *other* places it ſignifie, whenſoever the *adjuncts* or *context* ſo determine it, unleſſe it do (or can be pretended to do) ſo *here*?

7. This being premiſed, that which follows is yet more ſtrange,

that (*θρησκεία signifying false religion as well as true*) *the composition makes it worse*; *worse* then what? then *false religion?* This is fairly to resolve that the use of any thing *uncommanded* in the *service* of the *true God*, is *worse* then *false religion indefinitely*, i. e. then *Idolatry* or *Superstition*; and the *reason* annext is of the same *temper*, [*adding the work of mans will is abominable to God.*]

8. Here indeed is a *foundation* of charge of *Idolatry*, or whatever is most *abominable* on this poor *Church* of ours, for the bare using of any most *innnocent ceremony*, But this all the while incumbent on the *Diatribist* to *prove*, and as it will not be granted for *asking*, so it is not so neerly approaching toward truth, as to want any farther *answer*, then the reciting of it, I cannot yet be so uncharitable to Mr. *C.* as to imagine it his *serious* opinion that *kneeling* in *prayer* or *thanksgiving* to *God*, on purpose to expresse our *lowly reverence* to him, or *bowing* at the name of *Jesus*, in token that we *believe* him to be the *eternal God*, in opposition to the *ancient* or *modern Arians* and *Socinians*, is *abominable* to *God*, and *worse* then *false religion*.

9. And though his *following question* confirms this to be his opinion [*Do not all Idolaters pretend wisdom in their inventions*, citing in the *margent Psal*: 106. 39. *went a whoring with their own inventions*] yet tis not to be *believed*, that he can in earnest thence *conclude*, Therefore all inventions of *men* are *Idolatry*, and *worse* then *Idolatry*; If he can, 'tis sufficient to reply, that though all *Idolatry* be *invented* and *devised worship*, yet all *inventions* of *men* are not *Idolatry*, though every *beast* be a *living creature*, yet every *living creature* is not a *beast*; And so that though *Idolatrous Will-worship* be abominable to *God*, yet all *Will-worship* is not *Idolatrous*.

10. Once more he presseth this argument, *Doth not*, saith he, *this pretence* (*of wisdom*) *make it more odious to God, as taking upon them to be wiser then he, and more devout then he requires?*] But it may suffice once for all, that he that useth an *uncommanded ceremony* in the *service* of *God*, doth not *take upon him to be wiser then God*, but walking *regularly* in *obedience* to the *divine rule*, wheresoever there is any *particularly* given, acts according to *reason* and the more *universal* rules of *Decency*, &c. where *God* hath

not

not particularly preſcribed any thing. And ſo again in *acts* of *uncommanded devotion*; doing that *voluntarily* out of *love* to *God* which *God requires* not *ſub periculo animæ*, and ſo which is not *extorted* by *fear*, either of *offending* or *ſuffering*, this is again no *elevating* our own *wiſdome* above *Gods*, but our making uſe of thoſe *advantages* and thoſe *liberties* which *God* in his *wiſdome* choſe to afford us, that there might be ſomewhat for us *freely* to exerciſe his graces upon, and ſo for him as *freely* to reward in us. And of this there is no *fear*, that it ſhall ever be counted any *irregular* acting, and having *God's* promiſe to be *rewarded*, it is ſafe from being *odious* or *abominable* before him.

11. Thus I hope I have vindicated the *good* ſenſe of the word as farre as in my 3d. Reaſon I *pretended* from the *Greek Fathers* concurrence with me.

12. As for the *Latines* and *later interpreters*, to which the *Diatribiſt* now calls me, and asks me *why I did not tell him, how they rendred the word*? To this I anſwer, that as I have not *commodity* to examine all thoſe *interpreters* in this matter, ſo I did not think my ſelf *obliged* to do it, having never pretended that the *notion* which I give is *univerſally* received by *all Expoſitors*, I acknowledge, that *all* men have not rendred the word in a *good* ſenſe, particularly that the *vulgar Latine* reads it *Superſtitio* (though in *what* acception of that word I know not, moſt *probably* in an *ill* ſenſe) but ſure this with no more *truth* or *analogie* for ſo interpreting, then is for their interpreting the *Paſſive* δουλωσας by *decernitis*, v. 20. which is no leſs then to change *ſubjection* into *command*, *undergoing* a *yoke*, into *impoſing* of it, one *contrary* into another.

13 However from thence tis nothing ſtrange that the *ill* ſenſe ſhould be transfuſed into thoſe *Expoſitors* which follow and never depart from that *Latine tranſlation*, neither examining the *original* word, nor the *context*, to *reforme* that *tranſlation* by it. This was the task which I then undertook, and having found the *context* to incline it to a *good* ſenſe, and the *Greek* word to bear it very well, and the *Greek Fathers* to concur with me in their notion of it, I thought I might lawfully queſtion the authority of the *vulgar Latine*, and thoſe who had been lead by it, (and ſo we know are the *Papiſts*, and from them *others* alſo, who do not take

take *notice who* tis that leads them) and attempt that here which I saw ordinarily practised by *all* other sorts of men, the *Learned Papists* themselves (and, I doubt not, by this *Diatribist*, when he conceives himself to have reason for it) i. e. depart from their words and *conduct*, as in other so in this particular.

14. In so doing I now see without any search, that I have such a *concurrence* as will secure it from any censure of *singularity*. Beside the *Greek Fathers* forementioned, the * *Diatribist* tells me I have *Bellarmine's* consent (adding *some other Papists* also) and I hope his *authority alone* were considerable enough, if there were not also *some others*, to *weigh* in the *balance* with *Salmeron* and *Estius*, which are all the *modern* Expositors here cited by him.

*p. 69.

15. And among the *Protestants*, to *Hugo Grotius*, already cited, I now adde *Monsieur Daillé* in his *late* tract *de Jejuniis*, written *ex instituto* against *Bellarmine*, and yet in this place of St *Paul* contested between them, he expressely acknowledges with *Bellarmine* the very thing that I concluded, *viz.* that those *false teachers had a threefold colour of wisdome*, 1. In *Will-worship*, 2. In *humility*, 3. In *austerity to the body*, *for which three things they admire these their doctrines of men*; defining ἐθελοθρησκεία *cultum sponte & voluntariè assumtum nulla cogente Dei lege*, *a worship undertaken voluntarily and of their own accord without any law of God constraining them*, and again that *by the whole discourse of the Apostle it appeares that they commended and set off their doctrines of abstinence by this*, *that voluntarily ex quadam zeli & sanctificationis abundantiâ susciperentur*, *they were voluntarily undertaken out of an abundance of zeal and holiness*. And so in his opinion if *abundance of zeal and holiness* were taken in a *good* sense, *Will-worship* must be resolved to be so taken.

l. 1. *c.* 7.

16. And so this Exposition of that *learned* man, who will not be deemed *partial* to me against the *Diatribist*, may now deserve to be *considered* by him, as soon as the *contrary* of any *modern* Expositor *produced*, or, I believe, *producible* by him.

17. For as to those *antient Latine Fathers*, whom he hath *already* produced, they are but three, *Ambrose*, *Hierom*, and the *vulgar Latine*, and those three may be reduced also, and in fine will amount

amount to little more then the *one* ſingle *vulgar Tranſlator*. This is generally ſuppoſed to be St *Hierome* (and if it be not, tis certainly ſomebody whom St *Hierome* followed, St *Hieromes* ſhort *notes* on the *Epiſtles* being affixt to that *tranſlation*) and ſo St *Hieromes* name is no addition to that, onely ſerved the *Diatribiſts* turn, as in a *falſe* muſter, to bear *two* names to appear *twice*, and fill two ſpaces in his *catalogue*.

18. And for the onely *Father* now remaining, St *Ambroſe*, if thoſe *Comments* be his, which go under his *name*, they will bring no great *prejudice* to our *pretenſions*, for by *paraphraſing* [ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ] by *ſimulatione religionis*, all that can be *concluded* is, that thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinence* had not any *reality*, but onely a *falſe guiſe* of *religion* in them, and ſo it follows there, *Hinc ſe ſapientiæ rationem habere putant, quia traditioni humanæ nomen religionis applicant, & religio appellatur cum ſit ſacrilegium, Hence they think themſelves to have ſome appearance of wiſdome, becauſe they apply the name of religion to humane tradition, and it is called religion, when it is ſacrilege*; And this I may eaſily grant, and conſequently that the *Will-worſhip* here, and ſo likewiſe the *humility*, were not either of them truely *ſuch*, and ſo *offended* in this, that they were not what they *pretended* to be, and would not have been *criminous*, if they had been *really* ſuch; which ſtill devolves all the *fault* on the *doctrines* and on the *hypocriſie*, not on the *Will-worſhip*, or *Religion*, whoſe name would never have been pretended to by *hypocrites*, if it had not been *good*. See §. 7. of this ch. n. 10.

19. Mean while I gueſs not how *Theodoret* which is acknowledged to be a *Greek Father*, came to be ranked among the *Latines*, and a *Latine interpretation* of ἐθελοθρησκεία cited out of him; However I never pretended, that all either *Greek* or *Latine*, or particularly that he *concurred* with me in this ſenſe, & therefore am not obliged to give any farther account of his *interpretation*. Onely this I am ſure of, that tis not the *uncommandedneſs* of the *worſhips*, that he finds fault with, but 1. Their *teaching* thoſe for *Gods commands*, which are *their own*; (That is the meaning of ἴδιον ἐισφέρειν δόγμα, *their introducing their own ordinances*, τὴν ἄκαιρον αὐτῶν διδασκαλίαν, *their unſeaſonable Judaical doctrine*) and 2dly. Their *bare ſhew* of *piety* and *humility*, without

the *truth* of either (σχῆμα περικειμένου, οὐκ ἀλήθειαν) whereas by by his *conclusion*, it is most evident, that the *abstinences* without the *doctrines* would not have been deemed by him *reproveable*, and so not the bare *uncommandedness* of the *worship*, for thus we have it in the close, Γνώμῃ γὰρ ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ, οὐκ ὡς βδελυκτῶν ἀλλ' ὡς ἡδίστων, *For abstinences ought to be by counsell, not as from detestable, but as from the most delectable things.* Which is the very thing, which all this while we have endevoured to *conclude* from that place.

20. After these his *Latine Fathers*, he hastens to *later interpreters*, and those are two, *Salmeron* and *Estius*, and those *two* are *one* again, the one taking from the *other* as the manner is, without any considerable *difference*. But to give his *Testimonies* their full weight, we will view them *distinctly*.

21. *Salmeron* begins with observing, that *whereas the Vulgar Latine reads, in Superstitione and humilitate, & non ad parcendum corpori, the Greek hath onely three, words*, ἐθελοθρησκεία, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἀφειδία σώματος, *which three*, saith he, *sunt tres colores ostendentes rationem & specimen sapientiæ, are three colours shewing a specimen* (which by the way is more then *speciem*, or *bare shew*, some *real evidence*) *of that wisdome* (to which those *doctrines* of *abstinences* pretended) *And the first of these*, saith he, *signifies cultum spontaneum, sive voluntariam religionem, a spontaneous worship, or voluntary religion pro arbitrio cujusvis abstinendi a cibis, of absteining from meats as every man shall think fit*, and afterwards, *illâ voce alludit ad voluntarias oblationes legis quæ nedaboth dicuntur*, Deut. 16. & Amos 5. *By this word he alludes to the voluntary oblations of the Law, which are called* נדבות And then I shall desire the *Diatribist* to consider, how fitly *Salmeron* was called out to give *testimony* against me, (he, and one more, in the name of all *later interpreters*) when it is *evident* from these words, that he saith the very *same* thing, which all this while I contend for, if I could have thought fit to have defended my self from *singularity*, by his *Testimony*.

22. Tis true indeed he conceives the words to *allude* to v. 18. *volens in humilitate & religione*, and so goes along with *Estius*, and others in that *mistake*, which I had taken *notice* of in them, and

and that might have eaſily led him into farther *miſtake*, if the *evidence* of the *truth*, or ſome other better *guide* had not rectified him; But as it is, I have no reaſon to *complain* of him, as to the word ἐθελοθρησκεία which is now before us.

23. Somewhat more he addes of the word ταπεινοφροσύνη which *ſignifying*, ſaith he, *the virtue of humility, is here uſed for a feigned humility, which is contrary to the Goſpel, becauſe by it the Judaizers Evangelio legem admiſcebant, mixt the law with the Goſpel*, And as this is alſo perfectly *concordant* to my *notions*, ſo to this it is, that he brings the *teſtimonies* of *Auguſtine* and *Thomas*, and not for the notion of ἐθελοθρησκεία, as the *Diatribiſt* cites them out of *Eſtius*.

24. However to manifeſt my care of profiting by all his *animadverſions*, I ſhall view thoſe *teſtimonies* alſo. The one thing which *Salmeron* cites from both of them, is this, that *omnis ritus colendi Deum qui à Deo non eſt, nec à Spiritu ſancto per Eccleſiam traditus, ſed voluntate hominum inventus, ſuperſtitioſus eſt, every rite of worſhipping God, that is not delivered from God, nor from the holy Ghoſt by the Church, but is invented by the will of man, is ſuperſtitious*. Where it ſeems, that which is delivered by the *Church*, being by him ſuppoſed to be from the *holy Ghoſt*, doth in no degree fall under this *cenſure*, And then the *Diatribiſt* hath free leave to make his beſt *advantage* of this *citation*.

25. As for *Eſtius* his main endevour in the *interpretation* of the *verſe*, is to evince that λόγος ſignifies *ſpeciem in genere, ſive veram ſive falſam, a ſpecies in general, whether true or falſe*, which is very little for the *Diatribiſts* advantage, for granting it to ſignifie *ſpecies*, if that ſhould prove a *true* one, then that is perfectly *deſtructive* to his *intereſts*, for ſuch a *ſpecies* of *wiſdom* nothing could have in *Will-worſhip*, if *Will-worſhip* were ſuppoſed to be *impious* and *fooliſh*; And if it ſhould prove a *falſe ſpecies*, and ſo a *bare ſhew of wiſdom*, yet is that very *reconcileable* with the *good* notion of *Will-worſhip*, as hath oft been ſhew'd.

26. What *follows* in him, is, ſaith he, *ſecundum Auguſtinum & Thomam, according to Auguſtine and Thomas*, that theſe *abſtinences have rationem ſapientiæ non veræ, ſed ejus quæ ſita eſt in ſuperſtitione & humilitate, quæ falſa eſt ſapientia, not true wiſdom, but that which is placed in ſuperſtition and humility, which*

is false wisdome. But where *Augustine* or *Thomas* give him authority to pretend their *accord* with him, he cites not. In all reason this defect must be supplied by *Salmeron*, who cited in the *margent*, *August: lib. de verâ rel: & lib. 2. de doctr. Christ.* c. 25. *and Thomas* 2^a. 2^{ae} *qu.* 93. *art.* 1.

27. What place in *Augustines* book *de vera relig.* it is, to which he *referres*, we have no direction, and so are left to guesse, that it is cap. 55. *Non sit nobis religio in phantasmatibus nostris, Melius est enim qualecumq; verum quàm omne quicquid pro arbitrio fingi potest, Let not our religion be placed in our fantasmes, for any thing which is true is better then whatsoever can be feigned at our own pleasure.* And as to the truth of this position I give full *consent*, that all *fictitious false worship* is to be *avoided*, not only (as he contents himself to say) unfit to *compare* with true, so I no where undertake to be *advocate* for any *false* or *fictitious*, or *fantastick religion.* The commemorating the *birth* of *Christ* on the 25th of *December*, I hope, is not such, nor any *Ceremony* admitted into *use* in our *Church.*

28. The other place out of the 2^d *de doctr. Christ.* c. 55. stands thus; Having at the 20th *Chapter* defined *Superstitiosum superstitious*, to be *whatsoever was instituted by men, for the making or worshipping of Idols*, and that either *belonging to the worshipping any Creature*, or *part of a Creature as God*, or *to consulting or making any pacts with Devils* &c. and having fallen on the *several* sorts of *divinations* c. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. he begins his 25th ch. *quibus amputatis atq; eradicatis ab animo Christiano, deinceps videndæ sunt institutiones hominum non superstitiosæ*, i. e. *non cum damonibus, sed cum ipsis hominibus institutæ, the former being lopt off, and eradicated from a Christians minde, let us farther view such institutions of men as are not superstitious*, i. e. *are not made with Devils but with men themselves*, And having added somewhat of such *vain institutions* (which sure no way concern the matter now in hand) he comes to those which are useful *to humane society*, and resolves that such are not to be *avoided* by a *Christian, imò etiam, quantum satis est, intuenda, memoriaque retinenda, but in a competent manner to be observed and retained*, and this how little it belongs to the present purpose, to the proving ἐθελοθρησκεία to be here used in an *ill* sense, is already so apparent,

rent, that I need adde no word more to the clearing of it.

29. As for the place of *Aquinas* 2^a. $2^æ$. *qu.* 93. *art.* 1. It is the very ſame, which long ago, we conſidered in the former part of this *Tract*, ch. 3. §. 3. n. 5. and to the view of it, there preſented, I refer the *reader*, finding nothing more in that whole place *art.* 1. which was not there punctually conſidered, unleſſe it be a citation out of the *Gloſſe Col.* 2. *quòd ſuperſtitio eſt, quando traditioni humanæ religionis nomen applicatur*, that it *is ſuperſtition when the name of religion is applied to the tradition of men*, which words have nothing in them, which I am not ready to acknowledge, being ſufficiently aſſured, that *dogmatizing* is a *ſin*, and conſequently that ſo *good* a *name* as *religion* ought not to be *pretended* for, or *applied* to it.

30. What he addes by way of *anſwer* to my *fourth* reaſon, hath, I think, nothing of *moment* in it, but what hath oft been ſpoken to already, unleſſe it be that he ſaith, he *hath not obſerved any ſuch difficulty or obſcurity in that text Col.* 2. 20. &c. but *dares ſay, the Doctors expoſition makes the greateſt obſcurity that ever he met with:* But of this there is no *diſputing*, I muſt not expect that he ſhall acknowledge my *interpretation* to be clear, when he diſlikes it, or diſcern the *involutions* or difficulties of that *other* which he hath *eſpouſed*, when, if he did, he were obliged to forſake it.

Sect. 12.

The fifth reaſon vindicated. Ἐθελοθρησκεία. *Heſychius corrected twiſe.* Ἐθελονλῶ *adverbially.* Ἐθέλημ☉. Ἐθελοκωφῶν. Ἐθελοπρόξει☉. *Heſychius's Gloſſary concordant to th Scripture uſe.* Εὐχαριλεία, Eph. 5. 4.

1. TO my *fifth reaſon* taken from *Heſychius*'s rendring it by ἐθελοσέβεια *voluntary piety* or *worſhip*, and the notion which he had of ἐθελο in compoſition, to *ſignifie* that which a man did ἐθελόντως *voluntarily*, and ἐκών of his *own accord*, agreeably to which the נְדָב וּת *freewill-offerings* are rendred by the *Septua-*

give ἑκόντα *voluntary performances*, his *anſwer* is brief, that *this is no advantage to my cauſe, for the words may both ſignifie well-deviſed worſhip in an ill ſenſe. And though in humane authors the derivatives and compounds of this word expreſſe the Freewillingneſſe of the perſon, yet that will not help the Doctor who doth not underſtand* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in reſpect to the willingneſſe of the perſon in a commanded worſhip of God, but voluntary worſhip*, i. e. *worſhip not commanded by God, but offered to him by the free will of man.*

2 To this I reply, 1. that I willingly confeſſe ἐθελοσέβεια as capable of an ill ſenſe, as ἐθελοθρησκία, i. e. that when the *worſhip is forbidden* or *falſe*, then being *ill*, the *voluntarineſſe* of it can infuſe no *goodneſſe* into it, as when it is of it ſelf *good*, the *uncommandedneſſe* cannot make it *ill*.

3. And therefore 2dly this was not it on which I laid the *weight* (only I thought ἐθελοσέβεια had not been ſo likely to hear *ill* with *gainſayers*, as this other which I ſaw was fallen under *great prejudice* with ſome) but rather that which followed of the other compounds of ἐθελο which *ſignifie* no more but doing ſomewhat *voluntarily*, or of their own accord, without any *neceſſity* to doe it.

4. 3dly. Then I ſay that acknowledging it my notion of the word to ſignifie *worſhip not commanded by God*, the *authority* of *Heſychius* and the other *Greek Gloſſaries* which concur with, or follow him, is clear and home to confirm *that* to be the meaning of it.

5. If that which is ſaid already be not ſufficient to lay the *parallel* directly betwixt *Will-worſhip* and *voluntary oblations*, or *performances* of things not *commanded*, then adde 1. from *Heſychius* again, that ἐθελονταὶ ſignifies ἑκόντες, αὐτοβούλητοι, *voluntary*, proceeding from his *own will*, and that ſure is diſtant enough from the *will* or *command* of *another*. The words in *Heſychius* are certainly falſe *printed* (as much of that book is) ἐθελονταὶ, ἑκόντος, αὐτοβουλήτου. It muſt queſtionleſſe thus be mended, either ἐθελοντὴς. ἑκόντες, αὐτοβούλητοι, or elſe in ſtead of ἐθελοντὴς we muſt read ἐθελοντὶ *adverbially*, for ſo *Suidas* fetcheth that word out of approved authors; and which way ſoever it is, the *ſenſe* is the ſame, that ἐθελοντὴς ſignifies one that doth any thing

thing *from his own*, not anothers *will* or *command*, whereas the word to ſignifie πρόθυμος *voluntary* in performing *commands*, is by him ſet ἐθέλημος, not ἐθελοντὴς, for ſo thoſe two words muſt be read together (and not ſevered, as they now are in the vulgar copie) ἐθελημοι, πρόθυμοι, as immediately after, ἐθελήμως πρόθύμως.

6 So again of the two words formerly cited b y me ἐθελοκωφῶν, and ἐθελοπρόξενος, the *former* certainly ſignifies the *freeneſs* of the *matter*, not of the *perſon*, one that is *willingly deaf* or *diſobedient*, ἐθελήσει παρακούων, which ſure cannot be phanſied a doing that *freely* or *willingly* which is *commanded*, for no man is *commanded* to be *diſobedient*, and in like manner the latter is rendred by *Suidas*, ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτῦ γινόμενος καὶ μὴ κελευσθεὶς ἐκ πόλεως, *he that is made ſuch by himſelf, and not commanded by the city*, adding οἱ δὲ πρόξενοι κελευόμενοι ἐκ τῆ ἑαυτῶν πόλεως ἐγίνοντο, ſetting ἐθελοπρόξενος directly in oppoſition to κελευόμενος πρόξενος, *voluntary*, to *commanded* by another, and *Phavorinus* repeats the very ſame words, onely with the change of the *Gender* ἡ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς γινομένη, καὶ μὴ κελευσθεῖσα ἐκ πόλεως, adding alſo (as ſeldome he omits to do) what *Heſychius* had ſaid, ἑκὼν πρόξενος. The ſame may appear again by ἐθελοκακήσας, ἑκουσίως τὸ κακὸν ἐκλεξάμενος, *he that chooſeth ill voluntarily*, i. e. he which of his *own* accord *chooſeth* the *evil*, both in *Phavorinus* and *Suidas*, where ſure that which he *chooſeth voluntarily*, is not firſt *commanded* by *God*, being ſuppoſed to be *evill*. And ſo ſtill theſe *compoſitions* from ἐθελο ſignifie all of them in *perfect* accord with my notion of *will-worſhip*, i. e. a performance *voluntarily* taken up, without any *command* of *God*.

7. And indeed tis a little ſtrange that this *Diatribiſt*, who takes it here in an *ill* ſenſe, and places the *ill* in this, that it is an *uncommanded worſhip*, ſhould yet here diſpute againſt this ſignification of ἐθελοθρησκεία, for *voluntary worſhip*, *uncommanded* by *God*, and phanſie that I pretend no more but the *free-willingneſs* of the *perſon* in a *commanded worſhip* of *God*.

8. What he addes in the end of that 15th §. that *though the word in other authors be taken for voluntary worſhip, and be but once uſed in Scripture, yet the Spirit of God uſeth words in a ſenſe clearly different from other authors*, inſtancing in ἐυτρεπελία,

λεία, *Eph.* 5. 4. *taken for a vice, which in* Aristotle *is taken for a virtue,*] will soon receive answer, For 1. *Hesychius* being the *author* now peculiarly under consideration, and his *Glosses* having a speciall *propriety* to the explicating of words in *Scripture*, what is said by him, is not so much the sense of *other authors*, as of the *Scripture* it self, and so cannot *reasonably* be thought distant from it.

9. 2dly. Though some *words* are taken in the *Scripture* in a *sense different from other authors*, this is not applicable to *all* words of *Scripture*, some are used in *ordinary* vulgar senses, and by much the greater part of words there, and from thence to conclude of ἀθελοθρησκεία, that it is taken in a *different* sense, is to conclude and *syllogize* from *particulars*, which is against all *Laws* of *Logick*.

10. 3dly. Whensoever a word in any place of *Scripture* is affirmed to be used in such a *different* sense, that must be concluded either by the *circumstances* of the *text*, which so inforce it, or else by comparing it with *other* places of *Scripture*, where that sense is *necessary*; as when ἐυτραπελεία is concluded to be a *vice*, *Eph.* 5. 4. tis manifest by the *context* it must do so, for to it is immediately annext, τὰ μὴ ἀνήκοντα, *which are* (not onely *not convenient*, but, as that phrase denotes) very *inconvenient*, nay as the companions of it there, πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, αἰσχρότης, μωρολογία inforce, *filthy*, *noisome*, *unsavory*, so as *folly* oft signifies *uncleanness*, and so this is a visible *reason* also, why the word is taken in an *ill* sense, when *Aristotle*, meaning onely *cleanly*, not *beastly jesting*, takes it in a *good* sense: But of ἀθελοθρησκεία this no way appears in this one place where tis used, but on the *contrary*, the *society* in which tis found, *humility* and *self-denyal* or *austerity* determine it to be the *good* sense, as certainly, as the *company* of ἐυτραπελεία determine that to an *ill*. And so much for my 5^t Reason.

Sect. 13.

Sect. 13.

Mr. C. his distinction of voluntary. Spontaneous. A work of love. The Testimony of Socrates. Worship true or false. Nothing unlawfull which is not forbidden. Voluntaryness no way forbidden. The second Commandment.

1. TO my *last reason* [*because things done in the service of God are not therefore ill because spontaneous, but on the contrary, that when out of a pious affection a man shall do any thing else beside what God hath commanded by any particular precept, this action of his is so much more commendable and acceptable to God,*] he thinks it sufficient to *distinguish* of *voluntary* either as it denotes the *manner* or the *efficient cause* of *worship*; in the *first* respect *that is voluntary*, saith he, *which yet is necessary*, viz. *commanded by God*, in the *second*, *that onely which is done by the will of man contradistinguisht to the will of God.*

2. But this *distinction* is very far from *answering* my *reason*. For of the *second*, it is, he knowes, that I understand the word, and that I might prevent all *want* of this or the like *distinction*, I speak most plainly, using the word *Spontaneous*, not *voluntary*, on purpose to denote that which was done by *mans will* on his *own* accord, without any *command* of *Gods*; for so sure *Spontaneous* signifies (however the *Diatribist* here confounds it with *voluntary*, and so *involves*, in stead of *extricating*, *mixes*, when he went to *distinguish*) that which is *suâ sponte* from a mans *own incitation*, not from any *external impellent*, whether *command* or *punishment* attending it, for this indeed being done thus *freely*, is perfectly a work of *love*, and that renders it so extremely *gratefull*, and *rewardable* by *God*. I shall give you the description of it in the words of * *Socrates* speaking of *Ecclesiastical rites*; Επει δὲ οὐδεὶς περὶ τούτου ἔγγραφον ἔχει δεῖξαι παράγγελμα, δῆλον ὡς περὶ τούτου τῇ ἑκάστου γνώμῃ καὶ προαιρέσει ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος μὴ φόβῳ μηδὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τὸ ἀγαθὸν κατεργάζοιτο, *Seeing no man can shew any written command for this, it is manifest that the Apostles left this to every mans judgement and will, that every* *Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 22.*

man might do good, neither by fear nor of neceſſity.

3. When he addes, that *in worſhip deviſed by man the will bears all the blame, and then the more voluntary; the more abominable*] I anſwer, that *worſhip* is either *falſe* or *true*, *bad* or *good*, *Heathen* or *Chriſtian*, His rule is perfectly true in *unlawful wicked worſhip*, all the blame thereof lyes on the *will* of *man*, but it can have no place, where the *worſhip* is *lawfull*, for then no blame is due at all, but the more free it is, tis ſo much the more *commendable*. Now it is of *lawfull* and *Chriſtian* worſhip that we here ſpeak, as he knows well enough, or elſe it were not imaginable we could take it in a *good* ſenſe, and of this he muſt needs *underſtand* us alſo; or elſe he could not make all the *blame* of it in *mans will* or *deviſing*, as he doth.

4. And that a *worſhip* in it *ſelf*, and *materially lawfull*, i. e. whilſt it is abſtracted from the *conſideration* of *Gods commanding* it, or not, ſhould by *not* being *commanded* by *God*, become *unlawfull*, this is to *confound* things moſt *diſtant*, *forbidding* and *not forbidding*; For the *Law* and *Will* of *God* being the *rule*, in agreement with, or *oppoſition* to which, *lawfull* and *unlawfull* conſiſts, it is as impoſſible that any thing ſhould be *unlawfull* in reſpect of *Gods Law*, which is not *forbidden* by it, as that any thing ſhould be *lawfull* which is *forbidden*.

5. When therefore he proceeds, *affirming* (but offering no *proof*) that the *voluntarineſs of an action is the ἀνομία or irregularity of it*, firſt, this is a *begging* the *queſtion*; 2. 'Tis ſet in ſuch terms, that it hath not the leaſt *appearance* of *truth* in it, for how can the *voluntarineſs* be the *ἀνομία* or *irregularity*, unleſs the *Law* forbid *voluntarineſs*, which certainly it no way doth, as was formerly evideneed from hence, *becauſe there is no univerſall negative command in Scripture, prohibiting all acts and degrees of acts, beſide what are in particular commanded.*

6. That there is no ſuch, ſufficiently appear, by the *one* inſtance, which here he thinks fit to mention, that of the 2^d *Commandment*, *which*, ſaith he, *forbids all things*, i. e. *all worſhip and all degrees of that worſhip, beſides what are particularly commanded.* Which though it be as far from all *appearance* of *truth* as any thing affirmable by any (for what word is there in that *Command-*

ment,

ment, which can ſound that way? Certainly none, unleſſe every *ceremony* deviſed by *man* and every degree whether of *charity* or *devotion*, which is not particularly under *precept*, be preſently *metamorphoſed* into a *graven image*) hath not yet any the leaſt *proof* to back it, and ſo ſtill is the meaneſt *begging* of the main *queſtion* imaginable. And ſo having more largely ſpoken of this before, this is ſufficient alſo to be ſaid here in the *vindication* of my *laſt reaſon*.

Sect. 14.

The firſt occaſion of miſtaking ἰθελοθρησκία *for ill. The vulgar tranſlator and Mr.* Calvin. *The Diatribiſts three exceptions to this ſhewed to be of no force. Will-worſhip diſtant from Superſtition.* Θρησκία *only in a good ſenſe among Chriſtians. Three miſtakes of the Diatribiſt. All uncommanded is not forbidden.*

1. HIS next poſt or Stage is made up of an examination of thoſe things to which I conceived the *miſtake* and *abuſe* of ἰθελοθρησκία imputable. The firſt of which I aſſigned to be the *vulgar tranſlations* rendring it *Superſtitio*, that being moſt probably S. *Hieroms*, and his words being found agreeable to it in ſome places, and from thence Mr. *Calvin* hath affirmed it, *Superſtitio Græcis dicitur* ἰθελοθρησκία.

2. That this was fit to be inſiſted on as a *firſt occaſion* of the *miſtake*, will be evident enough to any, who conſiders how ordinary it is for the *Romaniſts* on one ſide without farther *inquiry* or conſideration to follow the *vulgar tranſlation*, and for the *reformed* on the other to follow the ſteps of Mr. *Calvin*, and not alwaies to examine his grounds of affirming, which certainly were very farre from *ſolid* in this matter, it being evident to all that know any thing of words, that δεισιδαιμονία is the *Greek* for *Superſtition*, and not ἰθελοθρησκία, nay that ἰθελοθρησκία being but once uſed in *Scripture*, and not found in any *author*, but ſuch as may be reſolved to have uſed it from thence, Mr. *Calvins* words, that *Superſtitio* is cal-

led by the *Greeks* ἐθελοθρησκία, cannot probably signifie any more then that the *Greek* word in that *one* place is by the *vulgar translator* rendred *Superstitio*. And then this is an *evidence* of that which there I affirmed, that the *occasion* of taking ἐθελοθρησκία in in an *ill* sense (which I must be allowed to deem a *mistake*) is the *vulgar translators* rendring it *Superstitio*.

3. Now to this, three things are here objected, though not to the main of the observation (for no word is replied to that) yet to the mention of the *Greek words* δεισιδαιμονία &c. First that a *man may say as much for* δεισιδαιμονία *it self as the Doctor saith for* ἐθελοθρησκία, *and bring the Doctor for his voucher who saith that* δεισιδαιμονία *sometimes is taken in a good sense*.

4. But I reply 1. that the *Doctor never* saith that δεισιδαιμονία is taken in a *good* sense among *Christians*, who sure never allowed the *worship* of *Damons*, but only among *heathens*, who do allow it. 2. That if it were sometimes taken in *good* sense, yet that were not sufficient to conclude that it were all one with ἐθελοθρησκία, all *good* things are not the *same*, no nor all *ill*, and therefore in whatsoever sense the words are taken, whether both in *good* or both in *ill*, the one in *good*, the other in *ill* sense. yet still the nature and importance of the words is *distant*, & so ought not to have been confounded either by the *vulgar translator* or by Mr. *Calvin*, and being so unduly confounded, the *Diatribist* cannot from thence raise any more *solid argument* for the *ill* sense of the one, then I can (which I pretend not to do) for the *good* sense of the other.

4. 2dly He objects, that θρησκία, *as the Doctor knowes, is taken also sometimes in an ill sense, as well as a good, why then*, saith he, *may they not both equally signifie superstition? especially when applied to false or men-devised worship*. I answer, that θρησκία when spoken of *Christians* is never taken in an *ill* sense, unless by virtue of some *Epithet* joined with it, which it self is *ill*, as ματαία θρησκία in S. *James*, *vain religion*, and then also tis the vanity which hath the *ill* sense, not the *religion*. And again that *vain* or *ill religion*, is not *superstition* neither, but an unagreeableness of the *Professors* practice to his *religion*. Now he knows it is of *Christians* that now we speak, and so there could be no place for this *exception*, nor for any thing to be founded in it, nor

plea

plea from hence that either the *ſimple* or the *compound* ſhould be rendred *ſuperſtition*; As for the *men deviſed worſhip* that that ſhould be *ſynonymous* with *falſe*, that is the old artifice of *begging* the *queſtion*, in ſtead of ſaying ought for the *gaining* of it.

5. His *laſt* exception is, that *Superſtition* or *Will-worſhip is more general then* δεισιδαιμονία, *that's but one ſpecies of ſuperſtition, if taken* (*as the word imports*) *for Dæmonum cultus. But all falſe worſhip is ſuperſtition, and the rather becauſe it is ſpontaneous, voluntary*, i. e. *Will-deviſed worſhip*.] Here is a fair *proportion* of miſtakes, without any tender of *proof* for any, no leſſe then three in theſe ſo few words.

6. *Firſt*, he begins with a preſumption that *Superſtition* and *Will-worſhip* are all *one*, and that he knowes is now the one thing denied by him, with whom he is *diſputing*, and he cannot be ignorant, how *illogical* an *argument* that is, we have oft minded him of that *fallacy*.

7. *Secondly*, he affirms that either of theſe is *more general then* δεισιδαιμονία, whereas 1. *Superſtitio* being *ſuperſtitum cultus*, is directly all *one* with δεισιδαιμονία which is *dæmonum cultus*, the *Superſtites* and δαίμονες being the ſame in ſeveral *languages*, and the other notion of *Superſtition* (that in *Aquinas* for *prohibited* or *illegitime worſhip*) that is but a *branch* of the former, ariſing by *analogy* with it, and is not any *oppoſite Species* to it; and for *Will-worſhip*, if that be more *general* then δεισιδαιμονία, that very thing will prove it 1. not to be all *one* with δεισιδαιμονία, a *ſubſtance*, which is the more *general*, is not all one with a *body*, which is a *Species* of *ſubſtance*; The truth is that the *generical Will-worſhip*, as that comprehends all *worſhip uncommanded* by *God*, hath ſeveral *Species* under it, *Jewiſh out-dated*, and ſo now *uncommanded worſhip*, *heatheniſh forbidden*, and ſo *uncommanded worſhip*, and finally *Chriſtian acceptable*, yet not *commanded acts*, or *circumſtances*, or *degrees* of *worſhip*; And as the *genus* is not all *one* with any one *Species*, ſo *Will-worſhip* in *general* is not any *one* of theſe, but *all* of them together. And 2. It implies the word to be capable of a *good* as well as of an *ill* ſenſe, and ſo indeed it is, being taken in a *latitude*, *Will-worſhip*, or as he will ſtyle it, *men deviſed* or *Will deviſed worſhip*, may be of *two* ſorts, (as the *generical* word *Worſhip*, may) either *true*,

or *false*, *heathen* or *Christian*, and as the one is *ill*, so the other is certainly *good*.

8. But then what is that to the *Will-worship* in this *text*, which is not the *generical*, as that is common to *good* and *bad*, but that which is in the *Diatribists* understanding, a *wicked* and *false*, and in mine a *good* and a *Christian Will-worship*, and which soever of the two it is, it is certainly not *both*, and so still but a *Species* of the *generical Will-worship*, and so not the *genus* it self.

9. Lastly, when he saith, *all false worship is superstitious, and the rather because it is spontaneous*, this is a strange involution again; For the whole truth of that *proposition* [*All false worship is Superstition*] consisting in this, that all *worship* of *false gods*, or *forbidden worship* of the *true God*, is wont to be comprised under that name, the former according to the *literal* sense of the word *Superstitum cultus*, the latter as reducible, or by *analogy* agreeable to that, it is very unreasonable to *superstruct* upon this, that that *false worship* is the *rather superstitious because it is spontaneous*, It being certain, that if it offend not some other way then by being *spontaneous*, i. e. if it be not in respect of the *matter* of it, *false worship* and so *forbidden*, it is not *superstition* at all, and if it be *false worship*, in it self *forbidden*, then sure it is more then *spontaneous*, for so must all be that is actually *forbidden*. So that there is not the least degree of *appearance* of truth in that last *affirmation*.

10. That which is indeed *false worship* is more then *spontaneous* (the *uncommandednesse* of it is *precedent* and *inferior* in order of *nature*, to its being *forbidden*, and its being *forbidden* is an *addition* to its not being *commanded*) the *falseness* consists in its being *devised* by *mans will*, not simply, but in *opposition* to *Gods*, i. e. when tis *forbidden*, and it would not otherwise be *false worship*, if it were not forbidden either *directly* or by *analogy* with somewhat which is directly *forbidden*, and what is *forbidden* is more then *not commanded*, and so more then *spontaneous*, and so the ill of it cannot be increased by being *spontaneous*, and so it is not the rather *superstition* (or any other kind of evil) for being *spontaneous*.

11. On the other side, that *worship* which is supposed *not* to be *forbidden*, is consequently thereto, to be resolved not to be *false*, and if

if it be not *false*, it cannot be *Superstition* (for such onely is *false worship*) and if so, then again the *voluntariness* or *Spontaneity* of it cannot make it *more false* or *more Superstition*, then before it was, because it was neither *false* nor *Superstition* before, and the bare *uncommandedness* cannot render it either, *Gods not commanding* implying his *permission*, and so a *liberty* allowed by *God*, and that is so far from being all one with *prohibited*, that it is in effect the very *contradictory* to it, this being *permitted* by *God*, whereas all that is *prohibited* is *not permitted*. And so here is a *competent* number of *infirmities* in very *few* words.

31. And yet there is still *one* behind, the great *impertinency* of this, and of the *two* former answers to the point in *hand*, the *occasions*, to which it is imputable that *Will-worship* came to be taken among many in an *ill* sense, which without *question* (at least without any word of *exception* from this *Diatribists three* branches of this 18th §.) is the *vulgars* rendring ἐθελοθρησκεία *Superstitio*, and Mr. *Calvin's* following the *vulgar*.

Sect. 15.

The second occasion of taking ἐθελοθρησκεία *in an ill sense vindicated. The design of the Treatise of Will-worship, onely for ceremonies, not for new kinds of worship. Whether all ceremonies be forbidden, which are not commanded. The various reading of Philostorgius. Sitting at the Gospell forbidden.* Chrysostomes *Testimonie.* Τετράθηρον *not* τετράθυρον. θεῖος θεσμὸς *for Ecclesiastical Canon.* pilpeopþunȝa *Will-worship.*

1. THe *second cause* of *mistaking* this word I had set down at large, §. 19. to be the reflexion on the *Judaical* θεοκρατεία, where, in the *building* of, and *officiating* in the *Temple*, all was to be done according to the *pattern* in the *mount*, from which some may have made a shift to conclude, that so it must be in the *Christian Church, no rite, no circumstance, no degree of worship to be used there but what hath Christ's example or precept to authorize*

thorize it. To this he *replyes*, 1. That I *much miſtake the queſtion, for it is not about a rite or circumſtance or degree of worſhip commanded, but of the worſhip it ſelf, and herein Chriſtians are equal with the Jews, we muſt not vary from the preſcription on the mount in the* 2d *Commandment to conſtitute any part of worſhip, but what we have the authority of Chriſt for in the New Teſtament*, adding the *ground*, for this, both the 2d *Commandment*, and this *text Col.* 2. to *juſtifie* that *aſſertion.*

2. To this I haſten this *brief* reply, 1. That this is not, in any word, to the point now in *hand*, the *occaſion* of taking *Will-worſhip* in an *ill* ſenſe, and tis evident that though all were true which here is ſaid, that I *miſtook the queſtion*, and that no *part* of *worſhip* may *lawfully* be ſet up among *Chriſtians* without the *example* or *precept* of *Chriſt*, yet this of the *Jewiſh obligation* to do all according to the *pattern* in the *mount*, may be occaſion to give men *prejudices* to all that is not under *particular command*, or according to *pattern* of *Chriſts*, and his *Apoſtles*, which was all I aſſumed in that *Section.*

3. But then 2dly. 'Tis moſt certain, that I do *not miſtake* the *queſtion*, nor *can* I *miſtake* it (who had the *ſetting* it my ſelf) unleſs I firſt *ſet* it one way, and then *handle* it another, And this certainly I do not. For the very *deſign* of that *Treatiſe* was to *inquire*, whether the *obſervation* of *ceremonies* uſed and preſcribed in our *Church* of *England* were *criminous*, onely upon this account, becauſe they were *not commanded* by *God*; And in this I was then ſure that I had *adverſaries* enow, who concluded it ſo, upon this one way of *probation*, becauſe all *Will-worſhip* was *criminous*, and the *uſe* and *impoſition* of all *uncommanded ceremonies* were *Will-worſhip.*

4. And if this *Diatribiſt* be not in the number of thoſe *adverſaries*, then hath he done himſelf and me and the *reader* very great *injury*, in *diſputing* againſt that *concluſion* which he doth not *oppoſe*, then hath he moſt prodigally *miſpent* and laviſht out all his *pains*, in confuting (or *exerciſing* himſelf upon) this *tract*, of which this was the onely *deſign*, not to plead for any *new kind* or *parts* of *worſhip*, but to *juſtifie* the uſe of *uncommanded ceremonies* and *circumſtances*, and ſuch are *days* of *worſhip*, and to ſhew that being *unforbidden* as well as *uncommanded*, they were therefore

therefore *lawfull* and free to be used by *Christian* people or *prescribed* by *Christian Magistrates*. And if he hath nothing to *resist* in this, then why should he delight in this *impertinent severity*, *arreign* and *triumph* over a poor *innocent* Tract, that never thought to provoke any, which allowed the *use* and *observance* of *uncommanded rites*, and *days* of *worship*, never attempted in the least to bring any new *part* or *kind* of *worship* into the *Church*? Upon this, and other visible *reasons*, it will sure be needless here to *examine* again his two *grounds*, which we have formerly been so oft acquainted with, the 2^d^ *Commandment* and *Col.* 2. 23. It was no small *infirmity* of discourse in this place to *mention* them.

5. The 2^d^ part of his reply, is, that *in worship that is condemned which is not commanded*] But 1. What is that again to the point in *hand*, that *particular occasion* of taking *Will-worship* in an *ill* sense? 2. I shall demand, is that proposition *universally* true, so as to extend to every *ceremonie* in *worship*? If it be, then it seems, I *mistook* not the *question* (as very lately I was told) nor my *adversary* neither) this *Diatribist* being directly *contrary* to me herein, if he thus affirme, that *in the worship of God every ceremonie is forbidden which is not commanded.*

6. To the place in *Photius's* ἐκλογαὶ out of *Philostorgius*, which I proposed and explained, he acknowledges he *hath little to say*, yet somewhat he is willing to *note* for his own *advantage*, viz. that I *seem to make it a fault to sit at the reading of the Gospel, which the Ecclesiastical Canons did not command, and yet make it no fault to adde a Will-worship of a mans own which* θεῖος θεσμὸς *the divine law doth forbid.*

7. To this I *answer*, that the *Diatribist* ought in all reason to have *markt*, what there I set visible before his eyes, and then he could not possibly have *mentioned* this. For 'tis evident in that place, 1. That I had taken notice of the reading of the *Manuscript* in the *Oxford Publike Library*, which hath ἐπεκράτει, in stead of ἐπιτάττει in *Gotofred's Printed Copie*, and 2. That as this *latter* reading imported it a *fault* to do that which the *Canons commanded not* (for which very cause I *examined*, and then saw reason to *reject* that reading) so the former and right reading, to which onely I adhered, implied no more then this, that it was a *fault* to act

contrary to *Canon*, to do many things ἃ μὴ θεῖος θεσμὸς ἐπιτρέπει, *which the Eccleſiaſtical Canon did not admit* or *permit*, or which was *not in uſe* with the *Church* of *God*, but the *contrary*, viz. that of *ſtanding* up at the *Goſpell*.

8. If there need proof of this, the plain words of * *Chryſoſtome* (or whoſoever was the *Author* of the *Oration* εἰς τὸ ἐπιδρόμιον) will be ſufficient, τὸ διακόνου ἀνοίγειν μέλλοντος τὸ τῶν εὐαγγελίων πεπόδηκον (ſo it muſt be read, as appears, p. 974. l. 20. where we find τὸ εὐαγγελίου πεπόδηκον ἅρμα, not πεπαδευον, as it is now Printed) πάντες ἐντεῦθεν ἀπενίζομεν, ἀσυχίαν παρέχοντες, καὶ ὅλως τῷ λόγῳ ἐπαναπόσιον ἀρξεται, ἐυδέως διανιστάμεθα ἡμεῖς, ἐπιφωνοῦντες, ἀλλὰ δόξα σοὶ Κύριε, *When the Deacon is about to open the Goſpell* (*that Chariot drawn with four horſes*) *we all look very earneſtly upon him and are ſtill, and when he begins to read* (*and ſo to run his race* in that Chariot) *preſently we ſtand up and uſe this acclamation, Glory be to thee, O Lord.*

* *Edit. Savil. Tom. 6. p. 975.*

9. Certainly the *Diatribiſt* never expected that his *Exercitations* ſhould be *examined* by any, or but *compared* with the plain words of the *Treatiſe* to which they *related*, when he thought fit to obſerve this.

10. He is pleaſed alſo to retain that rendring of θεῖος θεσμὸς *divine Law*, which he muſt needs diſcern to have been there cleared by me to ſignifie not the *Law* or *word* of *God*, but the *Canons* or *unwritten cuſtomes* of the *Church*, as there appeared by *Nicephorus* reciting that place of *Philoſtorgius*, and reading ἀκλησιαστικὸς, in ſtead of θεῖος, and by many other *evidences* from *Epiphanius* and *Athanaſius* and *Pſeudo-Clement*, and *Nicephori Conſtantinop*: στιχομυθία, ſuperadded to the former ſtore, in the *Annotation* on *Col.* 2. publiſhed ſince that *Treatiſe*. To all which I now adde *Leo*, who having mentioned *Divinorum Reverentia Sanctionum*, the *reverence of divine ſanctions*, ſoon explains his meaning firſt by *quod publicâ lege celebratur*, then by *quod univerſa Eccleſia ſuſcipit*, *that which was obſerved by publick Law, that which the univerſall Church received.*

* *Ser. 3. de jejun. 7. menſ.*

11. Another parallel miſtake alſo I there mentioned in our *Anglican Councels*, *Can.* 60. *Sub Edgaro*, where πεποιημένα is tranſlated *ficta ad libitum adorationes*, but ſhould be rendred *fontis*

fontis adoratio, not *Will-worſhip* but *Well-worſhip*, for which I referre the *Reader* to the former place in the *Annotations*.

Sect. 16.

The third occaſion of the miſtake cleared. Worſhip of Angels forbidden, not only not commanded. The reviving Judaical worſhip not called Will-worſhip, Col. 2. 23. *Maimonides's words wreſted to a diſtant ſenſe by the Diatribiſt. Original of Angel-worſhip. Vain worſhips. Clement confounding of* Col. 2. 18. *with* 23. *Worſhip of Angels &c. a forbidden Will-worſhip. The impoſing of virginity and abſtinences, as from God, the only crime, found fault with by S.* Paul *and the ancient Catholiks.* Alcibiades *his uſing, and remiſſion of auſterity. The like of* Spiridion *and* Marcianus. Cyrill *of meats.* 1 Tim. 5. 23. *explicated.*

1. A Third *occaſion* of the miſtaken *ill* notion of ἐθελοθρησκεία I had taken notice of to be the *confounding* of *two* verſes very diſtant, the 18th and 23d of that 2d *Chap.* to the *Coloſ.* the *voluntary humility* and *worſhipping* of the *Angels* in the one, and the *ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip and humility* in the other. To which end I at large cleared the difference between thoſe *two phraſes*. To this he replies, that the *diſtance pretended between them is ſo little, that they may eaſily be reconciled, that reſpecting a new deviſed worſhip only, and this the reviving an old out-dated worſhip.*

2. To this I *anſwer*, 1. that the *worſhip* v. 18. being expreſſely the *worſhip* of *Angels*, that ſure is much more then *Will-worſhip* in the *Diatribiſts* notion hitherto expreſſed of it, and therefore 'tis ſtrange he ſhould now labour to *perſwade* us they are *all one*, or eaſily *reconciled*. *Will-worſhip*, as he hath hitherto *defined* it, is bare *uncommanded*, *will-deviſed*, or *men-deviſed worſhip*, and that he hath ſtill pronounced *unlawful* upon that one account, becauſe not *commanded*. But can he think the *worſhip* of *Angels* to be ſuch? Is not that diſtinctly *forbidden* in the *firſt Command-*

ment? Certainly it is; And if it be, hath it no other guilt by being ſo *forbidden*, above that which is onely *not commanded?* 2 The *Will-worſhip* v. 23. is not truly affirmed to be the *reviving old out-dated worſhip*, For 1. the *abſtinences* from *mariage* there ſpoken of, as well as thoſe from *meats*, had never been *commanded* among the *Jews*. 2. Tis not there affirmed of one or other *abſtinence*, that it was *Will-worſhip*, Only thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinences* of both ſorts are ſaid to *have a ſhew of wiſdom* in reſpect of the *Will-worſhip* diſcernible in them, and ſo likewiſe they are ſaid to have in reſpect of the *ſelf-denial*, and the *worſhip* of *Angels* in reſpect of the *humility*, that either *is*, or is *pretended* in them. And yet I hope it will not be ſaid that *humility* or *ſelf-denial* is the *reviving* of *Judaiſme*.

3. But however ſome *advantage* he reſolves to get by that §. and having no other means to *acquire* it, he will have it out of ſome words which I had cited out of *Maimonides*, the words are theſe, that *the greateſt part of Idolatry came into the world, exiſtimando hanc varietatem eſſe Dei voluntatem, by the opinion that God was honoured by the worſhip of his Angels or officers, and that it was his will to have men exerciſed in this variety of worſhip*. From hence the *Diatribiſt* ſubſumes, that *the error that brought the greateſt part of idolatry into the world was, that men conceived and taught that vain worſhips and ſuperſtitions were the will and pleaſure of God*.

4. Here I muſt demand what he means by *vain woſhips?* doth he mean bare *will-deviſed, uncommanded worſhips*, which have in his opinion no other *crime* in them, but their *uncommandedneſſe?* If ſo, then hath he much *miſapplied Maimonides's* words, as muſt be viſible to him, thoſe clearly belonging to the *worſhip* of *Angels* (and others beſide the one *God*) which all men are ſtrictly *forbidden* to *worſhip*. And then what a *confuſion* of things moſt *diſtant*, what an *injuſtice* is this?

5. But if by *vain* he deſigned *falſe forbidden worſhips*, ſuch as are by him fitly joined with *ſuperſtition*, and ſuch as the *worſhip* of *Angels* was, then indeed he knowes, or muſt in *charity* believe, that 'tis as much *mine* intereſt and *inclination*, as his, to faſten an *ill character* upon them, and to believe as much of the *danger* and *criminouſneſſe* of affirming them *acceptable* to *God*, as *Maimonides*

des could teach, or the *Diatribiſt* wiſh me to *believe*. I ſhall not fail therefore, I hope, to obey his *admonition*, if it be really ſuch, and be abundantly *cautious* neither to *juſtifie* nor *imitate*, what I ſo much *diſlike* and *abhorre* in them that are *guilty* of it.

6. What he next addes of *Clement Alexandrinus confounding thoſe two* the 18. and 23. *verſes*, was by me *produced* and willingly confeſt, and made an *evidence* of the point there in hand, that ſome have (though without all *reaſon*) *confounded* them, and it is not imaginable how this which ſo evidently proved what I brought it to prove (evidencing the *occaſion* of the *miſtake*) ſhould be ſo ſpeedily mentioned to the *diſproving* of it, or be farther *argumentative* againſt me, then I had before acknowledged by producing it: For ſure the *Diatribiſt* cannot pretend that *Clemens* his reading was the true, Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω ἐν ἰδελοθρησκίᾳ ταπεινοφροσύνης, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, if he can, all our *copies* of the *New Teſtament* will abundantly confute him. And then it is no very good *indication* of the truth of his *cauſe*, which is fain to catch hold on ſuch ſupports as this, which is acknowledged a *miſtake* in him, from whom it is *produced*, and ſo in all reaſon will cauſe *miſtake* to any that *borrowes* it from him.

7. But the *Diatribiſt* inlarges in two long *Sections* more to enervate what I had ſaid to ſhew the difference betwixt thoſe two *verſes*, And I need make no farther reply to them, then to refer the *reader* to the *two parts* of the *obſervation* (§.22. and 23. of the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*) to which his *anſwers* are applied, the ſecond of them clearly anſwering all that he hath *objected* to the *firſt* (if he would but have had *patience* to have lookt ſo much forward) and as *clearly preventing* what he hath ſaid to the ſecond.

8. The ſhort of it is, that the *worſhip* of *Angels* being not only *not commanded* but *forbidden* by *God*, the *voluntary worſhipping* of them is acknowledged by me to be a *fault*, but that *reſulting* from the *unlawfulneſs* of the matter, which is under *interdict* in the *firſt Commandment* of the *Decalogue*, not from the *voluntarineſs* or *uncommandednesſe* of it. And the ſame I ſhall not doubt to yield of the *abſtinences* from *meats* and *mariages*; *Chriſt* hath given *perfect liberty* for the uſing of *both*, and they that *dogmatize*

and *impose* either or both those *abstinences* on *Christians* as from *God*, are *false teachers*, and so that is their *fault* in *imposing*, and the like in those who δογματίζονται *subject* themselves to those *ordinances*; And yet for all this a *spontaneous abstaining* from *meats*, at some time, δι' ἄσκησιν, ἢ διὰ βδελυρίαν, *for exercise, not for detestation* (in a *religious fast*, not out of opinion of the *unlawfulnesse* of *meats*) being in it self perfectly *lawful*, and so likewise *celibacy* or *virginity* in him that *can receive* it, there is no pretense from the *uncommandednes's* of either, or both of these, that they should be deemed *culpable*, or made *parallel* to that *other* sort of *uncommanded worship*, where the matter is under *interdict*, the *worship* of *Angels* or imposing of *Iudaical abstinences*.

9. The matter is clear to any that shall but observe S. *Pauls doctrine* in several places, and the *arguings* of the *Catholiks* against the *Montanists*. S. *Paul*, who resolves *mariage* to be *honorable among all*, and so brands them for *heretiks* who *forbid to mary*, doth yet not only allow but *recommend virginity*; and so for *meats*, he professeth all to be *lawful* to all, and that no *question* is to be made *for conscience sake*, and accordingly censures the *Gnosticks* that they *commanded to abstain from meats*, and yet the same *Apostle* was himself *frequent in fastings*, and certainly had not the least *dislike* to those performances.

10. So in like manner the *Catholiks* or *orthodox Christians* of the *Primitive Church*, which objected it as a *fault* to the *Montanists*, that they *imposed fasting*, and made it *necessary* (as may appear by the *character* of *Montanus* given by *Apollonius* in * *Eusebius*, that he was ὁ τὰς νηστείας νομοθετήσας one that *required* and *exacted fastings* as by the *law* of the *Paraclete*, for so he styled himself, and the same is evident by *Tertullian* in his *Tract*, *De jejuniis*, when being turned *Montanist* he pleads their cause against the *Orthodox* under the name of *Psychici*) and which *anathematized* the *Marcionites* and *Encratites* &c: for deeming meats *unlawful*, do yet every where *commend* and *press* the use of *fasting*, as hath formerly been shewed in part, and as it is known to all that have but lookt into their *writings*.

* *Eccl. hist.* l. 5. c. 18.

11. The passage of the * *Epistle* of the *Christians* of *Lyons* and *Vienna* to the *Asiaticks* concerning *Aloibiades*, is remarkeable, he had

* *Euseb. hist. Eccl.* l. 5. c. 3.

had lived, say they, πανὺ αὐχμηρῶς *very austerely, using nothing but bread and water*, and when he was by the *persecutors* cast in *prison*, he *attempted to continue this strict diet*, but *Attalus*, who was in *prison*, and had once been *carried* out into the *amphitheatre*, advised him to *leave* it, ἀπεκαλύφθη, say they, *having received a Revelation*, that he should *not do well not to use the creatures of God*, adding that he would by that means, ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολείπεσθαι, *leave an example of scandal*, of *snare*, of stumbling *to others*, whereupon say they, *he eate freely and gave God thanks*. Here it seems his former course of *austerity* and severest *abstinence* was no way disliked (and had long been *practised* by that *Holy Martyr*) onely at this time it was thought not to be so fit to be *continued*, whether in respect of the *combat* which he was now to *undergo*, (ἀγῶνα ἐν ἀμφιθεάτρῳ *a combat in the amphitheatre*, and if he *macerated* himself too much he might not be so fit for so *weighty* and *difficult* an *undertaking*, and others also if they should follow his *example* might *weaken* themselves overmuch, and so be *ensnared* by that means) or in some other respect, wherein his *abstinence* might by the *example* be hurtfull to others. And upon these considerations he *intermitted* it; an *example* both of the *practise* of the *severest abstinences*, and of the *free* use of *meates* according to the doctrine of *Christian liberty*.

12. The same is yet more visible in the known passage of * *Spiridion*, one of the *Bishops* that sat in the *Councel* of *Nice*, who though with his family he observed *Lent* most *severely*, yet on occasion of a *weary* guest made no doubt to break his *customary* rules, and his *guest* being more *scrupulous* then he, παραιτούμενος καὶ λέγων χριστιανὸν ἑαυτὸν, *saying he was a Christian*, *Spiridion* replied, παύτῃ μᾶλλον οὐ παραιτητέον, he *was the rather not to scruple*, because he was a *Christian*, *the Scripture it self affirming that all things are pure to the pure*. And the same we have in the passage of *Marcianus* to *Avitus*, in * *The doret*, giving his reason for the breaking his *ascetick Laws* of *fasting*, that *charity was more honourable then fasting*, τὸ γὰρ τῆς θείας ἔργον νομοθεσίας, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμᾶς αὐτῶν ἐξουσίας, *the former being a work of Gods prescribing, the latter of our own freedome*.

* *Sozomen. l. 1. c. 11.*

* *Tom. 3. p. 791.*

13. The words of *Cyrill* of *Jerusalem Cat.* 4. may *conclude* this

this matter. Πολλοὶ μὲν τὰ βρώματα πταίουσι &c. *Many offend in this matter concerning meats, ſome eate indifferently all kind of meats, that which is offered to Idols &c. others abſtain, and condemne all that eate, and ſo the ſoul is diverſly polluted in this matter of meats, by not knowing the profitable cauſes of eating and not eating, when we faſt we abſtain from fliſh and wine, not hating them as abominations, but expecting our reward, that contemning ſenſible delights we may injoy the ſpiritual and intellectual Table, and that now ſowing in tears we may reap in joy in the world to come. Deſpiſe not therefore thoſe that eate, and partake, becauſe of the weakneſs of their bodies, neither find fault with* (ἔλαχε the *Barocian MS.* reads not ἤνεγκε) *thoſe that uſe a little wine for their ſtomack, and frequent infirmities, neither condemne them as ſinners* (the *Barocian MS.* adding to the *Printed Copies,* καὶ μήτε αὐτὸς ὡς ἁμαρτωλὸς κατακρίνῃς) *nor hate fleſh as ſtrange* (or unfit for *a Chriſtian*) *for of ſuch the Apoſtle took eſpecial notice, ſaying, they forbid to marry and abſtain from meats, from ſuch keep thy ſelf, and abſtain not from meats as deteſtable things, if thou doſt thou haſt no reward, but ſuppoſing them good, omit to make uſe of them* διὰ τὰ μεκείμενα (ἐλπιζόμενα the *Barocian Copie* reads) τοῦ τὰ χρείττονα, *becauſe of the intellectual better things which are ſet before thee,* or *wich* thou *hopeſt* to receive.

14. Where it is evident how *faſting* and *abſtinences* being freely and ſpontaneouſly uſed, and not as *neceſſary*, or the contrary *unlawfull*, but perfectly *ſpontaneous* and *uncommanded abſtinences*, are yet ſo far from being *ſinfull* (if they be not joyned with *condemning* of *others* which *eate*) that they are *highly rewardable* by *God*. Nothing could be ſaid more *dilucidly* and *fully* to this whole matter.

15. This place of *Cyrills* will by the way give us a *fuller* underſtanding of that *exhortation* of S. *Paul* to *Timothie*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. *Drinke no longer water, but uſe a little wine &c.*] then formerly I had taken notice of in the *Annotation* on that place, in relation to the words *precedent* there, *Lay hands ſuddenly on no man, neither partake of other mens ſins, keep thy ſelf pure, drinke no longer water &c.* Thus; thoſe that by the *Gnoſticks infuſions* and *falſe doctrines*, c. 4. 1, 2, 3. have been ſeduced into *error* and by that means fallen under thy *cenſures*, are not to

to be over *favorably* used, nor too *speedily absolved*, and then (on that occasion, as in a *parenthesis*) be sure thou fall not thy *self* into their *snares*, those *errors*, or *faults* consequent thereto, which thou art to *censure* in others; And these *errors* being specially *two*, the commanding to *abstain*, from *mariage* and from *meats*, for the former of them, be sure, that as thou *abstainest* from *mariage*, so thou preserve thy self perfectly *pure* from all the *Gnostick pollutions* consequent to their *doctrines* of *hating mariage*, (that is the meaning of ἁγνόν σε τήρει) and for the latter, though thou usest *austerities* and *fastings*, which may be usefull to *virginal Chastity*, yet do not this to the *hurting* of thy *body*, but in consideration of thy *infirme* habit of *body*, thy frequent *indispositions*, give thy self the use of *lawfull liberties*, take *wine* sometimes in a *moderate* proportion, & keep not thy self so strictly to *water-drinking*, as persons of *austerity* use to do.

16. All this (and much more might be added of the same nature) makes it most evident, that *uncommanded performances* (such sure were *virginity* or *fasting*) had no ill *character* fastned on them by those same *Orthodox Fathers*, who yet would not indure to have them *imposed* on *Christians*, as from *God*, but brand all such, as attempt it, for *false teachers*.

Sect. 17.

The last occasion of the ill sense. ἐθελοπρισσοθρησκεία *in Epiphanius. Of the Pharisees appellation.* Περισσόν. *Dogmatizing and discriminating. Epiphanius's words cleared. Wherein their hypocrisie consisted.* Ἑκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, 1 *Mac.* 2. 42. *Asidei* חֲסִיד ἑκουσιασμός *turned into* ἀνάγκη, *the fault.*

1. THe *last* occasion of the *ill* sense of ἐθελοθρησκεία, which I took notice of, was *Epiphanius's* mention of ἐθελοπρισσοθρησκεία, as the *denotation* of the *Pharisees name*, in respect of the *voluntary* performances wherein they pretended to *exceed* other *Jews*. And I leave the Reader to view in that place, §. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. what I thought fit to note on that *word*,

which when he hath done, I shall have some *confidence*, that he will need no farther *reply* of mine to demonstrate the *invalidity* of all this *Diatribist's exceptions* against those *Sections*.

2. For there he will find, 1. That the περισσὸν, as that may denote the *superfluity* of either *noxious*, or *ridiculous*, or but (for number) many and so *burthenous ceremonies*, is not pleaded for by me, and that is *answer* to his 24th §.

3. 2dly. That what was *blameable* in the *Pharisees* was not their bare using of some *lawfull*, *indifferent*, or else *good*, and *commendable* things, not *commanded* by *God*, but their *teaching* such for *doctrines*, and laying them as *burthens* on others, and what was consequent to this, their *discriminating* themselves *proudly* and *fastidiously* from other men, upon this account, and that *prevents* his 25th §.

4. 3dly. That I no way plead for the *Pharisees*, but affirme them *generally* to have been *ill* men and *hypocrites*; Onely I say that when they imposed that name of *Pharisee* upon themselves, sure they meant not to *reproach* themselves by so doing, and that *Epiphanius* saith they thus *imposed* it on pupose to denote their ἐθελοθρησκείαν, by that meaning some *performances* of theirs, wherein they conceived themselves to *exceed* all others, which again was the *preventing* of all that he addes §. 26. And left there should remain any doubt of this (the *Diatribist* setting it quite *another* way, and affirming that *Epiphanius cals the heresie of the Pharisees by that name, as offending both in Will-worships of their own devising, and also in the abundance and superfluity of them*) I shall set down here the words *punctually* as they are found in *Epiphanius*, and leave the Reader to judge on whose side the truth lyes in this particular. Ελήλυθε Φαρισαῖοι, saith he, διὰ τὸ ἀφωρισμένους εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὴν ἐθελοθρησκείαν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην, φασὶ γὰρ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα ἑρμηνεύεται ἀφωρισμός. *They were called Pharisees for being separated from others, because of the abundant Will-worship* whether *prescribed* or *customary* (so νενομισμένην frequently signifies) *among them, for Phares in Hebrew is interpreted Separation.*

Ad. 2. Hær. 16.

5. In which words what is there I pray which can give the least *ground* for the *Diatribists glosse*, either that *Epiphanius calls the heresie*

hereſie of the Phariſees by that name, when he only ſets it down as the *interpretation* of that name of *Phariſees*, long before *Epiphanius*, impoſed on them; or that this *name* was given them as a *character* of their *offending both in Will-worſhips* and in *the ſuperfluity of them*? Certainly neither of theſe hath the leaſt *appearance* of *foundation* in *Epiphanius*, I wonder the *Diatribiſt* could think fit to *cite* them from him.

6. 4thly That though *hypocriſie* were the *Phariſees* chief *crime*, and withal the *fewel* to their *pride* and *deſpiſing* of others, yet their doing ſome things which were *not commanded* was no part of this their *hypocriſie*, but on the contrary, either their *ſaying* but not *doing*, or their *doing* the *lighteſt* and *neglecting* the *weighteſt* duties, or their *preferring* their *own traditions* before the *commanded duties*, and making the obſervance of the one (as in *Corban*) their *commutation* and *excuſe* for *neglecting* the other, and this indeed was farre more likely to inflame their *pride* and *deſpiſing* of others, then the real *Chriſtian* neceſſary performances would have been; the *lighteſt* things aſcending *higheſt*, and appearing moſt *viſibly*, whileſt the *weightier* ſink down and lie *hid*.

7. But ſtill this is no *prejudice* to thoſe *real* performances of more *ſtrictneſſe* then the *law* exacts, *faſting twiſe in the week*, and the like, ſuppoſing, as we here ſuppoſe, that they are not uſed to the *ſupplanting* of *neceſſary* duties (but go along very *friendly* with the *practice* of them) and offend in no other reſpect, but that they are *uncommanded* performances. And this avoids all his *artifices* in §. 27.

8. 5thly That ἐκτιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ 1 *Mac.* 2. 42. ſignifies more then a *well mindedneſſe to the law*, meaning by that the *precepts* of *God*, moſt evidently a *ſpontaneous* performing of ſome things which the *law required not*. Let the place be there viewed, and theſe two things will be evident, 1. That that phraſe ἐκτιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ is ſet to denote the *Aſidei* by way of *periphraſis*; Now of them tis certain that they were ſo called from חָסִיד which we ordinarily render *mercy*, but ſignifies ſaith [a] *Kimchi* יתרון הטובה *excellence of goodneſs*, [b] others פלגת הטובה *abundance of goodneſs*, and in *Maimonides*, *exceſſum & ſupremum gradum* in one place, the *exceſſe and higheſt degree of any performance eſpecially of charity or beneficence*, and in [d] another, *benignitatem erga aliquem*

[a] *in Pſal.* 36.
[b] *Rabbini in Prov* 22. 28.
[c] *in Pirke Avo.*
[d] *More Nevoch. Part.* 3

aliquem cui nihil planè debes, vel erga eum qui beneficio dignus eſt, at non tanto, benignitу to him to whom you either ow nothing, or not ſo much as you afford him, by which it is manifeſt that the name *Aſidæi* denotes not only *willing* but *ſpontaneous* agents, which keep not themſelves within the *line* of the *law*, as to do nothing which is not *commanded*, but have their ἑκούσια *voluntary performances* to *offer* to *God*, above that which the משרת הדין the *line of law*, as the [c] *Rabbines* ſtyle it, exacts of them, and ſo are properly ſtyled ἑκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ *volunteers in* or *to the law*, as that is oppoſed to *preſt* or *hired ſouldiers* of it.

[c] *Rabbi Iſmael in Beracoth. c. 1.*

9. The *ſecond* thing is, that the men that are there particularly mentioned in that place of the *Maccabees*, are thoſe that *liſted* themſelves *voluntarily* under *Mattathias* to defend the *law* by *arms*, which was no where *required* of all men that were *Jewes*, but was the *act* of the *Zelots*, at that time, and ſo again an ἑκουσιασμὸς a *ſpontaneous* and *uncommanded* performance, *above* or beſide the *law*; and ſuch as theſe were farre from being blamed, being every where *commended* in thoſe men. And the *Diatribiſt* will never be able in the leaſt degree to make *good* againſt *Scaliger* (what he undertakes §. 28.) that our *Saviour condemned* them.

10. Laſtly, That all the *Fault* was when the ἑκουσιασμὸς was turned into ἀναγκη, when what they undertook and acted *laudably*, whileſt *ſpontaneouſly*, they at length *impoſed* on others, as *neceſſary*, and for that it is, that (beſide their *hypocriſie* of ſeveral kinds) the *Phariſees* are juſtly *cenſured* in this matter, and not for the *uncommandednеſſe* of their *actions*, and this with the former, are a full anſwer to §. 28.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

Of Free-will offerings.

Sect. 1.

The uſe of them in this queſtion. The Diatribiſts diſcourſe of them. His Κρησφύγετον. *The Leviticalneſs of ſpontaneous offerings aſſerted by him, in order to denying them among Chriſtians. Arguments againſt this conceit. Allowance of days as well as of worſhip among the Jewes. Allowance acknowledged by the Diatribiſt to be as good as commands.*

1. TO make it evident that all things which are *not commanded*, are not yet *unlawful* or *prohibited* in the *ſervice* of *God*, and conſequently that all *uncommanded ceremonies* and *circumſtances* (and under that head, *Feſtivals* i.e. *Times*) of *worſhip* are not *prohibited* to a *Chriſtian*, I thought it neceſſary in that *Tract* of *Will-worſhip* to reflect on the נדבות or *free-will-offerings* of the *Jewes*, which being *ſpontaneouſly*, and without any *obligation* of *divine law* preſented to *God*, were ſo farre from being *deteſted* or *diſliked*, that they were *accepted* and *rewarded* by him.

2. And on this head I inlarged in that *Treatiſe*, conceiving the ἐθελοθρησκεία once mentioned in the *New Teſtament*, *Col.* 2. and taken in the notion of *ſpontaneous* performances, to be directly *parallel* to thoſe ἑκούσια *voluntary* or *uncommanded oblations* among the *Iewes*, and from thence concluding, as I thought, *irrefragably*, that the *uncommandedneſſe* of a *few decent rites*, or uſeful *ſeaſons* ſet apart for the *worſhip* of *God*, could not upon that one account, their being *uncommanded*, become preſently *unlawful* and *criminous*, when even under the θεοκρατεία they were *allowed* and *accepted*. And if in any other *reſpect* there were *difference* betwixt the things thus *compared*, yet I was ſure there was none in that, wherein I compared them, both agreeing evident-

ly

ly in this, that they were equally *not commanded* or *preſcribed* by *God*, and ſo though the *obſervation* of *rites* or *ceremonies* or *feſtivals* arrived not to that *excellency* of being *parts*, but only *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, yet they would by thoſe *precedents* be ſecured from being *abominable* or *criminous* in the ſight of *God* upon that *one* account of *uncommandedneſſe*, for if ſuch they were, then the נדבות would be ſo too, and being ſuppoſed to be *uncommanded*, either *ſtand* together, or both *fall* under the ſame *condemnation*.

3. And to this part of my diſcourſe he at length proceeds §. 29. and finding *fault* with me for not ſetting down or ſhewing *wherein the formality of a free-will offering conſiſted*, he is pleaſed to ſpend ſome leaves on this *task*.

4. But as I had not offended in that kinde, nor needed this *ſupply* of his, there being evidently no more required to the *formality* of a *free-will offering*, but that 1. it were not particularly *commanded* by any *law* of *Gods*, and ſo were *ſpontaneous* (not *neceſſary*) to *offer*, or not to *offer*; 2. that it were *offered* to (and *graciouſly accepted* by) *God*, as being of thoſe kindes which are known to be *allowed* by him; and both theſe being evidently ſet down by me in that *Treatiſe* §. 29. I have little to thank him for in his *diſcourſe* on this ſubject, finding the greateſt part of it to concern the *preſcribed*, *commanded ſacrifices*, and the *willingneſs* firſt, and ſecondly ſome lower *degree* of *freeneſs* obſervable in them, both which are certainly nothing to our purpoſe, who ſpeak only of thoſe *oblations* which were *not commanded* and might freely *not* have been *offered* (to which none but the laſt *member* of his diſtinction appertains, *libertas exercitii*) and yet were *graciouſly accepted* by *God* when they were *offered*, which one ſort of *oblations* (meddling not with any other that were any way *commanded*) make it viſible, that even under the θεοκρατία, that *government* of the *Iewes* where *God* preſided immediatly and gave *lawes* preciſely for the very *manner* of his *worſhip*, ſome things were yet left to men's *free-power* and *choice*, if they *offered*, they ſhould be *accepted*, if they did *not offer*, they *ſinned not*, which is the perfect *image* and clear *interpretation* of that ἐθελοθρησκία or *will-worſhip*, for which that *Treatiſe* undertook to plead, that it was not *criminous* in a *Chriſtian*.

Now

5. Now of theſe *freewill offerings*, defined by him, p. 91. juſt as I now, and then defined them, there is but one thing onely which he obſerves by way of *præcognoſcendum* to his *anſwer* to that *Treatiſe*, and I muſt here take a particular *view* of it, becauſe I ſuppoſe it that, on which *all* his contrary *hypotheſis* muſt be founded; It is this, that *the formality of a freewill offering, as contradiſtinguiſhed to the offerings commanded by the Law, conſiſting in this, that it was left free for a man to offer or not to offer, beyond what was poſitively required by the Law, here*, ſaith he, *the Leviticalneſs or Ceremoniality ſeems to ly, whereby* (he pronounceth that) *they are now aboliſhed.* And afterwards oft to the ſame purpoſe, *that they were parts of the worſhip of God in thoſe times is true*, p. 92. intimating that *thoſe times* differed from *theſe times* in this reſpect; and *this inference*, ſaith he, *hath too much of the λόγος σοφίας ſhew of wiſdome, but neither ſubſtance, power, nor truth in it. It was ſo in the Old Teſtament, therefore it may be ſo in the New*, p. 93. and *Divines reſolve that the worſhip of God then, was far different from the worſhip of the Goſpell, and conclude the contrary. It rather follows, that they are not parts of worſhip now, becauſe that Levitical worſhip was aboliſhed.* p. 94. And this is his principall *engine* of *battery* to *demoliſh* all that I had ſaid from that *parallel* between thoſe *freewill offerings* and the ἐθελοθρησκεία in the *New Teſtament*.

6. I ſhall therefore, I ſay, make ſome ſtay here to *examine* and conſider this *reſerve* of his, for if it ſhall *fail* him, it is evident he hath no other *refuge* to retire to.

7. And 1. I ſuppoſe it ſufficiently *reſolved* between us, that the kind of the *worſhip* (that by *bloody ſacrifices* &c. among the *Jews*) was indeed *Levitical*, no longer to continue then the *Jewiſh prieſthood* of the *Tribe* of *Levi* continued, and ſo is long ſince *aboliſhed* by *Chriſt*, and accordingly I never *meant* (and I hope he cannot think I *meant*) to *conclude* that the *ſame kinds* of *freewill offerings* which were *acceptable* then, that of *ſlaying a Bullock* or a *Ramme* &c. do now continue *acceptable* among *Chriſtians*.

8. 2dly. Then the onely *queſtion* muſt be of the *ſpontaneouſneſs* of the *oblations*, whether that being confeſſedly *lawfull* and *acceptable*

table under the *Law*, it be now *unlawfull* under *Chriſt*, or in plain termes, whether *Gods acceptance* of *uncommanded oblations*, when the *matter* of them is confeſt to be ſuch as is *acceptable* to him, be to be deemed *Levitical*, and ſuch as being *peculiar* to the *Moſaical œconomie*, is not now to be lookt for, being *aboliſhed* under *Chriſt*?

9. The *queſtion* thus plainly ſet, his affirmation is too far from the the leaſt ſhew of *probability*, and ſo utterly diſtitute of all *proofs*, either from *reaſon* or *Scripture*, as far as he hath here *diſcovered* himſelf (and ſo but a *begging* of the *queſtion* in him that thus *affirmes*) that there is no need of my pains in *diſproving* it; Yet ſhall I offer a few conſiderations to this purpoſe, and the *firſt* ſuch as may be of force *ad hominem*, to this *Diatribiſt*.

10. And it ſhall be the reminding him of his *three* ſpeciall *proofs*, which he hath brought in his *Preface* and in his *Diatribe*, to infer the *ſinfulneſs* of *Will-worſhip*, viz. the 2^d^ *Commandment*, the *ſumme* of which is, as he oft ſaith, *Gods preſcribed worſhip*, and all *deviſed worſhip*, an *exceſs* and ſo *ſin* againſt it; The words of *Deut.* 4. 2. where all *additions* to the word are *prohibited*; And (to the particular of *Feſtivals*) the 4th *Commandment*, againſt which, ſaith he, it is an *offence* in the *exceſſe* to obſerve any other *holy day*, but that *one* of the *Weekly Sabbath*. Now of theſe three it is plain, that they are all taken out of the words of the *Judaical Law*, and conſequently if they were fitly urged to *Chriſtians*, then muſt it needs follow, 1. That they were thus of force againſt all *uncommanded ſervices* in the *Old Teſtament*: and 2. That by way of *analogie* they *ſtill* hold under the *New Teſtament*, which if they do, then is this the direct *contradictory* to both the *Diatribiſt's* preſent *pretenſions*, to his *allowing unpreſcribed uncommanded worſhip* under the *Old Teſtament*, for how can that be when his proofs againſt *uncommanded worſhip* are all fetcht from the *Old Teſtament*, to the *aboliſhing* in the *New Teſtament* what was *allowed* in the *Old*, for if ſo, how can the *analogie* hold betwixt the *Old* and the *New*, in which his three proofs were founded, as to the *application* of them to *Chriſtians*?

11. Which being ſo, the great evidences on which he had founded his *hypotheſis*, proving ſo *irreconcileable* with his preſent *pretenſion*,

ſion, I ſhall ſtill give him his *choice* which part of his *method* he will *adhere* to, the *former* or the *latter*; The former he cannot (the force of thoſe places in the *Moſaical Law*) for it is manifeſt by the *free-will offerings*, and now confeſt by the *Diatribiſts*, that *uncommanded worſhips* were *allowed*; and ſo *lawfull* among the *Jews*; And the *latter* he cannot, having formerly *ſuppoſed* in his arguing, that the *analogie* holds in this matter between the two *Teſtaments*.

12. So that I may now forme a *Syllogiſme* the *premiſes* whereof ſhall be both fetcht out of the *Diatribiſt*, the *Minor* from his very words, the *Major* from that on which his *arguments* are founded, thus, Whatſoever was *lawfull* under the *Old Teſtament*, is *lawfull* under the *New*; But *free will* or *uncommanded offerings* were *lawfull* under the *Old Teſtament*; (and then having given me me my *premiſes*, twill be great *unkindneſs* to deny my *concluſion*) therefore, *uncommanded offerings* are *lawfull* under the *New Teſtament*; *Quod erat demonſtrandum*.

13. A 2d *argument* againſt his *affirmation* ſhall be, the conſideration of the *liberty*, and *advantages* which reſult to *Chriſtians* from the *abolition* of the *Moſaical Law*. That *liberty* muſt conſiſt, in the *taking off*, not in the *impoſing* of *weights* and *interdicts*, whereas, by this *Diatribiſts* affirmation, there ſhall by this *abolition* of what was *Levitical*. i. e. by this *libert*, ycome in a multitude of unprofitable *burthens*, which never lay upon the *Jews*; Whenſoever I ſhall do any thing in the *ſervice* of *God*, which I am not particularly *commanded* to do, I am preſently *enſnared*, guilty of an *abominable* ſin, whereas a *Jew* might, by his *confeſſion*, bring a thouſand *free-will offerings*, and in each of them be *accepted*. This ſure muſt be directly againſt one main part of the deſign of *Chriſt's* coming, and therefore is not to be admitted in the 2d place.

14. 3dly. It is ſufficiently known, and by the *Apoſtle* affirmed, that they were δόγματα, *poſitive ordinances*, and νόμος τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι, *Eph.* 2. 15. *A Law of Commandments in ordinances*, which *Chriſt* did by his death καταργῆσαι *cancell* and *naile* to the *Croſs*, and indeed nothing elſe is capable of *abolition* or *cancelling*, But this of the *free-will offerings*, among the *Jews* is not any *Law* or *Commandments* or *Ordinances*, but rather a *negation*

of all those, (for such is a *bare allowance* to be deemed) and therefore sure this, as to the *voluntarinesse* of them, was none of the things which were *abolished* by *Christ*.

15. 4^thly. If it were true, which is here said by the *Diatribist*, that *the Leviticalness* or *Ceremoniality of the offerings seems to ly here*, viz. in the *uncommandedness* or *freedome* to *offer* or *not* to *offer* (wherein he truly saith, that *the formality of a freewill offering consists, as that is contradistinguished to the commanded offerings*) then sure the *Leviticalness* &c. would not extend to the *commandedness* of the other *offerings*, and consequently the *commanded offerings* under the *Law* would not be *Levitical*, Which as it is palpably *false*, and contrary to *plain Scripture*, *Heb.* 9. 1. 20. and elsewhere frequently, so it will farther conclude also, that the *commanded offerings* are still in force, for by the *Leviticalness* and *Ceremoniality*, saith he, *is was, that those other are supposed to be now abolished.*

16. 5^thly. Against his *conclusion* I thus *argue*, Whatsoever was *lawfull* before the *Mosaical Law* to mankind, and remained *lawfull* under the *Mosaical Law*, and is *not* now *prohibited* by *Christ* or his *Apostles* under the *Gospell*, that certainly is now perfectly *lawfull* and *free* to *Christians*; But such are *freewill offerings*, *Ergo*. Of the *Major* I suppose there will be no doubt; And the *Minor* consisting of *three* branches, is manifest in the *first* of them, among many others by *Abel's oblation*, which the *Fathers* generally observe not to have been by way of *precept* from *God*, and is affirmed by the *antient Author* of the Διαταξεις, the *Pseudo-Clement*, c. 22. (I say not how truly) that before the *Jews idolatries* and high *provocations*, *sacrifices themselves were not imposed on*, *or commanded the Jewes*, *but onely left to their free power*, ἐαν πιθῆς - *If thou wilt do it*, *but upon their provocations imposed*, ὅπως πεζόμβροι ὑπὸ κλοὶν ἐγχόμβροι τ πολυθεῖν πλάνην ἐκφύγωσιν, *that being constrained and compresst by this yoke*, *they might be kept from idolatry*. In the 2^d branch, it is granted by the *Diatribist*; And for the 3^d, it must ly upon him to shew any *prohibition* of *Christs* or his *Apostles*, which *forbids* to do any the least thing in the *service* of *God*, which is not particularly *commanded*: Now this he hath not yet attempted to do (no not here, where it was most *seasonable* and *necessary* to do it, the whole

whole *weight* of his cauſe being divolved upon it) and though it be not incumbent on me to prove a *negative*, yet having all *Chriſts prohibitions* before my eyes in the *New Teſtament*, where this would be diſcernible, if there were any ſuch, and being ſure that I cannot *diſcern* the leaſt *glimpſe* of any ſuch, and withal remembring upon what grounds the *Diatribiſt* affirms it, *viz.* upon the *Leviticalneſſe* and *ceremoniality* of theſe *free-will offerings*, which hath already been competently *diſproved*, and how *ſuſpicious* and *cautious* he was in *affirming* that, that the *Leviticalneſs ſeems to ly there*, not daring to affirm any more, then that ſo it ſeemed, (and that I muſt ſuppoſe only to *himſelf*, no *concurrence* of any other mans judgement appearing with him) I doubt not but that I may with ſobriety aſſume, that there will never be produced by him any ſuch *prohibition*, and then there can be no way of *ſuperſeding* the *concluſion*, that *uncommanded* performances in the *ſervice* of *God* are ſtill *lawful*.

17. But leſt this ſhould ſtill ſeem but a leſſe *perfect*, being only a *negative* probation, I muſt (to adde yet more force to it) refere the *Reader* to the many *poſitive* inſtances, in the *New Teſtament*, of ſuch *free-will* performances, as *contra-diſtinguiſht* to thoſe which are under *precept*, ſet down in that *Treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip*, §. 30, 31, 32. &c. and much more largely in the *Annotation* on *Col:* 2. And then this will abſolutely *ſuperſede* all that he hath thought fit to obſerve here proemial to the inſtance of the *Judaical free-will offerings*, or to reply to my *three* obſervations of them.

18. For as to that which he ſpecially inſiſteth on, and which only hath the leaſt ſhew of force in it, viz. *Gods* promulgate *allowance* of thoſe *free-will offerings* among the *Iewes*, without which he conceives it had been unlawful to the *Iewes* to offer them, 1. that *allowance* being no *command*, is an *irrefragable* proof that acts of *uncommanded worſhip* may be *allowed* and *accepted* by *God:* and 2dly. it muſt be ſome *poſitive* prohibition which is required to make any thing *unlawful*, the want of a *declared allowance* will not do it; and 3^ly. there are many *evidences* under the *New Teſtament* of the like *allowances* for thoſe things, which are not under *precept*, yea, and ſometimes of more then *allowance*, of *Gods accepting* and *rewarding* of them.

19. And if, as he *desires* to have it *observed*, those *voluntary oblations* were a *part* of *Gods worship*, then, though I am not obliged to make good the *parallel* so farre, as that every *rite* and *festival* shall be a *part* of *Gods worship* also, yet certainly I may conclude 1. that ἐθελοθρησκεία, *Will-worship* is such, and that is the whole matter of our *present debate*; 2dly that the *voluntary* (I mean *uncommanded spontaneous*) use of these *rites* &c. is now as *lawful*, as it would have been, if they had been *parts* of *worship*, both by force of the *argument*, *à majori ad minus*, (*parts* of *worship* are much more *considerable*, and more *specially* taken care for by *God* then *rites* and other such *circumstances*, the reasons of which may be *temporary* and *uncertain*, upon some *new* or *accidental* emergents, whilest the reasons of performing, or *instituting parts* of *Worship* are most *constant* and *certain*) and also because among the same *Iewes*, as we have *uncommanded offerings*, so we have *uncommanded daies* of *worship*, both *festival*, the *feast* of *Purim*, and of the *Dedication* of the *altar*, and *fasting*, that of the *fourth* and *fift*, and *seventh* and *tenth moneth*, in *Zachary*, and all these *allowed* by *God* among them, at least *approved*, when used without any *precedaneous special allowance*.

20. And then, if it have any truth in it (which the *Diatribist*, when he thinks it for his turn, saith *expressly*) that a *special allowance of God was as good, and equivalent to a command*, then, 1. *So Gods approbation* will be also; and 2dly I see not how he can avoid the *inference*, that then, it seems, these other *festivals* and *fasts* stood by *as good* an *authority* as did the *weekly Sabbath* of the fourth *Commandment*, or the great yearly *Sabbath*, the *day* of *Expiation*. But this by the way, what influence it will have in this whole *scheme* of *Phenomena*, I leave him to consider.

Sect. 2.

Sect. 2.

A firſt inſtance of uncommanded Pieties, Davids intention to build the Temple. Vindicated from the three anſwers of the Diatribiſt.

1. HIS 30th §. proceeds after theſe *preluſory skirmiſhes*, to adapt anſwers to the ſeveral *inſtances*, which I had given of *performances uncommanded*, and yet accepted by *God*, and the firſt is that of *David*, whoſe intention to build *God* a *Temple*, *exceeding Gods command*, 2 *Sam.*7.5.7. was yet very *acceptable* to *God*, 1 *King.* 1.18. and ſo appears to be by *Nathans* meſſage to him, in that place of *Samuel*. To this he hath returned three *branches* of *anſwer*, I ſhall take a brief view of them.

2. The firſt [that *this is one of* Bellarmines *arguments for their religious vowes, and is fully anſwered by* Chamier, 1. *that it was in time of the law, when free-will offerings were allowed, but the times of the Goſpel give no ſuch allowance*] is already *anſwered* in the laſt *Section*, where the *Leviticalneſſe* and ſo abolition of that *allowance* of *free-will offerings* was competently examined and *confuted*. Yet *ex abundanti* I here adde, that the *allowance* that was expreſt in the *law* belonging to *ſacrifices*, did not expreſſely pertain to the *building* of *Temples*, and if ſtill by the *analogy* or *parity* of *reaſon* it may be *extended* to ſuch other things, which were not expreſt in the *allowance*, and yet which were not meerly *ceremonial*, viz. to *Davids intention* of *building God* an *houſe*, when *God* had never expreſt any ſuch *command* or *deſire*, I deſire to hear ſome *ſatisfactory* reaſon, why the *parity* of reaſon may not in like manner extend the ſame allowance to *uncommanded* acts of *piety* under *Chriſt*, in caſe no ſuch *allowance* ſhould appear to be expreſt in the *Goſpel*.

3. This *firſt anſwer* therefore having ſo little of *ſolidity* in it, it was meet that it ſhould be introduced with a *proœme*, which might caſt a *prejudice* upon the *Argument*, *viz.* that it was one of Bellarmines *for religious vowes, and fully anſwered by* Chamier.

But 1. every *Argument* is not *invalid* which *Bellarmine* hath once uſed, I do not believe him ſo ill a *manager*, that a *ſharp* weapon taken into his hands would preſently be *blunted*. 2dly. *Belllarmines* uſing it to another purpoſe, that of *religious vowes*, ſuppoſing it *fully anſwered*, as to that, can have no *influence* on my uſing it to prove the *lawfulneſſe* of *ſpontaneous* performances of *piety*; It might not come home to ſuch *vowes*, and yet might and doth come home to *reſolutions* or *intentions*.

4. And therefore if this be the truth of the matter, as it lies betwixt *Chamier* and *Bellarmine*, if it concern only the buſineſſe of ſuch *religious vowes*, of *building a Temple* before *Gods pleaſure* be known concerning it and the like, then this *Diatribiſt* hath not done well to inlarge *Chamiers* words to this other ſo *diſtant* matter, and to vouch his authority both here and *formerly*, for the *abolition* of *free-will offerings* under the *Goſpel*. It cannot be a good cauſe, which needs ſuch *aides* as this.

5. His 2^d *anſwer* is, that *God doth not abſolutely deny that he had commanded, but ſaith he had not commanded it to* David, *or any before him, not becauſe he would not have it done, but becauſe not yet, and therefore foretels that* Solomon *ſhould do it*. To this I anſwer 1. that here is very *nice diſtinguiſhing betwixt abſolutely denying that he had commanded*, and *ſaying, he had not commanded*. Can *conſcience* ever be ſatisfied of the *ſinfulneſſe* of *voluntary oblations*, or the *charitableneſs* of *judging* a *Church ſuperſtitious* for uſing *uncommanded rites*, upon ſuch anſwers as theſe?

6. But 2. to diſinvolve this *intricacy*, and take aſunder this *ſubtile* fabrick, I demand, did *God* ever *command David*, or any *governor before him* to build him a *Temple*, or did he not? If he ſhall ſay, he did; Then is that expreſſely *repugnant* to the plain words of *Nathan* 2 *Sam.* 7. 5. *Thus ſaith the Lord, ſhalt thou build me an houſe to dwell in?* the *queſtion* implies, that he *ſhall not*, and v. 7. *Spake I a word with any of the tribes of Iſrael, ſaying, Why build ye not me an houſe of Cedar?* and ſo forward to the ſame purpoſe; But if he ſhall acknowledge that *God* never did thus *command David* or any *before* him to *build* him a *Temple*, then it is clear, his *intention* to *build* was a *free-will offering*, under no *command* of *God*, and yet that *intention accepted* and

com-

commended by *God*, which was all I undertook to conclude in this *inſtance*.

7. 3dly. What he addes, that *God ſaith this not becauſe he would not have it done, but becauſe not yet &c.* is evidently nothing to his *advantage*, for ſtill it is confeſt *God* would not have it done by *David*, which was all I *contended*, and then *Davids deſigning* to do it, was without *command*, and ſo a *freewill offering*; As for the *prediction*, that *Solomon* ſhould do it, 1. That is no *intimation* in the leaſt of any *command* to *David*; and 2. It followed *David's reſolution* of doing it, and was *God's anſwer* to *David*, *v.* 13. on occaſion of his *reſolving* to build *God a Temple*, v. 1, 2. and ſo that is onely a farther *evidence*, that what *David reſolved* to do, was, without any the leaſt *command*, onely that which the *dignity* of the *matter* ſuggeſted to a *pious* ſoul v. 1. 2. and accordingly was *approved* by *Nathan*, v. 3. *Goe doe all that is in thy heart*, and alſo by *God*, 1 *Kin.* 8. 18. though he were not *permitted* to *actuate* this *pious reſolution*.

8. His 3^d *anſwer* is, that *the houſe that* David *would build was not to be a part of worſhip, but by accident, as the houſe of Obed Edom, or the place where David ſetled the Arke, and our Churches now, onely a circumſtance of worſhip.* I anſwer, 1. So is a *Feſtival* now, a *time*, as that a *place*, and ſo equally a *circumſtance* of *worſhip*. And 2. It being already evident that *voluntary oblations* were then *lawfull*, and that thoſe are *parts* of *worſhip*, 'tis viſible that this had equally been *lawfull*, if it had been a *part*, as it is now, being but a *circumſtance* of *worſhip*.

9. But then 3dly. The *intention* of *building* this *plate* was ſure a *pious intention*, an act of *reverence* and *love* to *God*, whoſe *houſe* it was deſigned to be, and ſo that being *uncommanded* muſt needs be an ἐθελοσέβεια, and ſo directly *parallel* to the ἐθελοθρησκεία, to which I thought fit to *compare* it.

10. And ſo ſtill there is no other *virtue* in theſe *anſwers* ſave onely to *evidence* his *diſtruſt* in his σοφὸν φάρμακον, and to aſſure us, that he could not heartily believe, that *voluntary oblations* were now *aboliſhed* under the *New Teſtament*, for if really they were, having rendred that for his *firſt anſwer*, he could not have *wanted* or *ſatisfied* himſelf with ſuch *evaſions* as theſe.

Sect. 3.

Sect. 3.

A 2d instance, and that under the New Testament. Paul's *taking no hire from the Corinthians; This, no action of common life, nor yet a due debt.* Κατεχειν for *using*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 31. 1 *Cor.* 9. 17. *explained. The authority of* Augustine, Chrysostome *and* Theophylact.

1. MY 2d *instance* was that of St *Paul, who might have received hire for his labour among the Corinthians, but would not, and counts and calls this matter of boasting. This*, saith he, *is as little to the purpose, if not less, for it is not in an action of worship, but an action of common life as himself speaks, and it is also a mistake to call it a free-will offering, when it was a due debt.*

2. But 1. Tis certain that I no where *said* that this was *in an action of common life*, the *Reader*, if he will view the place at the top of p. 17. will find that it is *misreported*, and truely I should have been to blame to think the *Apostle's preaching* and *officiating* among the *Corinthians*, *in* which this was, to have been an *action of common life*; And I shall appeale to this *Diatribist* himself, whether he can really doubt, whether an *Apostle's* exercising his *office* be not an *act* of *worship*, and consequently any (but) *circumstance* thereof, a *circumstance* of *worship*, and this over and above, an act of *sacred alms* and so of *piety*. And if it be so, then this *instance* of St *Pauls* not receiving *hire*, was either an *action* or *in an action* of *worship*, or both, and so surely a נדבה or *free-willoffering*.

3. 2dly Then, for his assertion, that it was a *due debt* (for which he cites *Chamier*) I shall make my appeale no farther then to the *text* it self, and the notion, which the *Fathers* had of it.

4. The matter is set down at large, 1 *Cor.* 9. The *preaching* of the *Gospell*, saith the *Apostle*, was *committed* to him, and was under *precept* and so no *free-will offering* of his; That is his meaning, when he saith, *For if I do this willingly*, v. 17. ἑκὼν, as a *volunteer* (so saith * *Theophylact*, εἰ μὲν ἑκὼν εὐαγγελιζωμαι τὸ κήρυγμα

* *In* 1 *Cor.* 9.

ρυγμα, ἀφ' ἑμαυτοῦ δὲ τοῦτο ἐποίουν, *If I had not been commissionated to preach, but had done it of my self*, If I did *preach* the *Gospell* without any *command*, and so *necessity* to do so, if *of my self, spontaneously*, μισθὸν ἔχω, *I have the reward*, this would be *rewardable* in me, i. e. the very *preaching* would, without any other *honorable* circumstance to *inhanse* it, εἰ δὲ ἄκων, *but if involuntarily*, i. e. εἰ ἐνεχειρίσθην, saith *Theophylact*, *if I am commissionated to preach*, and so my *preaching* be an act of *obedience* to a plain *command*, and so *necessary*, v. 16. (and *woe to me if I do it not*) then all that can be said of me is, that οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, *being intrusted* with a *Stewardship*, I *discharge* it, προδηλον ὅτι οὐκ ἀφ' ἑμαυτοῦ τοῦτο ποιῶ, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικὴν ἐντολὴν πληρῶ, τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ ἄκων, *it is manifest that I do it not spontaneously, but I performe my Lords command, for this is the meaning of involuntary*; And so there is nothing of *excellence* in this, οὐ φιλοτιμία τὸ πρᾶγμα this will bring me in *no reward*, Upon which it follows, Τί οὖν μοί ἐστιν ὁ μισθός; *What reward then shall be to me?* i. e. What in this whole matter shall bring me in any *reward?* To which the *Apostle* answers, ἵνα ἀδάπανον θήσω, that *preaching* the *Gospell*, I do it *freely*, without making it *chargeable* to the auditors, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, *so that I make not use of* (not as we render it, *abuse not*) *my power* or *liberty* that I have in the *Gospell*, i. e. the *power* of receiving *maintenance* from others, whether by *hire* from them to whom he *preacht*, (the *labourer* being *worthy* of that) or by way of *aide* from other *pious* persons (such as *Phœbe* and the like, intimated by the ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα, some *Christian women* that *attended* and *ministred* to them v. 8.) without putting my self to *bodily labour* to earn *necessaries*, v. 6.

5. The doing of this thus was that which would yeild him the *reward*, And although this was not observed by *Cephas* and other *Apostles*, v. 5. yet sure *Cephas* is not conceived to have *sinned* thereby, but 'tis positively said that twas *lawfull* for all, v. 7. 11. 14. for as for *Cephas* and others, though onely *Paul* would not use it, v. 12. and accordingly both there, v. 15. and after, 2 *Cor.* 11. 9, 10. he distinctly *counts* and calls this matter of *rejoycing* or *boasting*, in respect to the *reward* which he was allowed to *expect* from *God* for it.

6. And so nothing can be more plain then that this was a נדבה a *voluntarie* act of *piety* in that *Apostle* toward his *Corinthians*, and so sure it was conceived by St *Augustine*, *Potuit Beatus Paulus ex Evangelio sibi victum quærere; quòd malvit operari, amplius erogabat*, *Blessed Paul might have had his food for his preaching; that he chose rather to labour* for it with his hands was a *greater liberality* then he was *bound* to. And * St *Chrysostome*, οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι κρεῖττον τὸ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ βέλτιον τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν, *he said not* those words, *Act.* 20. 35. *because it was ill to receive*, but *because it was better not to receive*. And * again, that it is τέταρτος καὶ ἀνωτάτω *the fourth* and *highest degree* of *munificence*, παρέχοντα καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα λαμβάνειν, μὴ λαμβάνειν, *for one that preacheth, and hath power to receive, yet not to receive*. And on the place to the *Corinthians*, τὸ μὲν ἐστὶν ἐπίταγμα, τὸ δὲ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν κατόρθωμα, *One was a precept, the other a virtuous action of his own choice*, ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐντολὴν, *above the Commandment*, καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο, *in this* very respect, πολλὸν ἔχει μισθὸν, *it hath a plentifull reward*; And again, of the word ἀνάγκη *necessity*, he saith, that it *pertains to the command* by which it became *necessary* πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῆς ἐν τῷ λαμβάνειν *in opposition to the freedome in receiving* (i. e. the *power* to *receive* from the *Corinthians*, v. 12.) forementioned. So again *Theophylact*, Τὸ δὲ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι ἐπίταγμά ἐστι, καὶ ἐὰν πληρῶ τοῦτο οὐδὲν κατόρθωμα, &c. *preaching the Gospell is a precept to me*, and so a *debt* from me, *and if I do it, there is no* great matter of *excellence* in it, τὸ δὲ ἀδαπάνως κηρύσσειν ἀφαιρέσεως φιλοτιμία, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο κόμπημα ἐστι, *but to preach without charging them is the honour of my will, and in that respect there is place of boasting*, in this I may fitly *rejoyce*.

* *In Act.* 21. *Tom.* 4. *p.* 860. *l.* 12.

* *Ibid. lin.* 20.

7. This I have set down thus largely to clear all *difficulties* or *doubts* in this matter, and to shew how punctually home it comes to the matter for which it was brought, to shew not onely the *lawfulness* but *acceptation* of such *uncommanded* performances now under the *Gospell*, as well as the נדבות under the *Law*.

8. The only *exception* he offers against this, is that from v. 18. where what he doth he saith was done that he *abuse not his power in the Gospel*; But saith he, *to abuse power is to sin*, &c. But that is

is already anſwered, that καταχρῆσθαι ſignifies to *uſe* to his own *advantage*, and not only to *abuſe*; Thus in *Lyſias*, ταύτας λαβὼν κατεχρήσατο, *he took and uſed them*, and in *Iſocrates* in *Panegyr.* ἐν καιρῷ κατεχρήσθαι *to make a ſeaſonable uſe* of other mens *actions*, by way of *example*: in *Plato*, ἐν ὀρθῶς κατεχρήσατο δωρεᾷ, *Ep.* 8. he hath not rightly *uſed the gift*. And ſo 1 *Cor.* 7. 31. χρώμενοι τῷ κόσμῳ ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι, *uſing the world as if they uſed it not*, ſo it muſt be rendred in *proportion* to what goes before, *weep as though they wept not, rejoyce as though they rejoiced not, buy as though they poſſeſſed not*, and ſo the *vulgar* reads, *tanquam non utantur*, *as if they uſed not*. And ſo *Chryſoſtome* on *Act.* 21. in the place even now cited, doth thus *paraphraſe* it, ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα λαμβάνειν, μὴ λαμβάνειν, *not to receive what he hath power to receive*, and ſo here *Theophylact* expreſſely interprets it, ἵνα μὴ καταχρήσωμαι, τυτέστιν ἁπλῶς χρήσωμαι, τῷ δὲ ἁπλῶς χρῆσθαι παρίχρηστον ἀνόμασεν, the word ſignifies *ſimply* to *uſe*; δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐδὲ οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἁμαρτάνουσι, *ſhewing that they which received, ſinned not a whit*, which is the *direct contrary* to the *concluſion* of this *Diatribiſt* from the ſame *premiſſe*; And ſo *Chryſoſtome* alſo δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐδὲ οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἐγκλημάτων ἄξιοι, by this expreſſion he *ſhewed*, *that they which received are not worthy of accuſations, guilty* of any *fault*; which they muſt be, if they are *bound* by any ſpecial *call*, as the *Diatribiſt* cites from *Chamier* (but againſt the whole contexture of the place) to do what they did. And ſo this may ſuffice for the ſecond *Inſtance*, ſo particular, and that in the *New Teſtament*.

Sect. 13.

The third of Paul's *going up to Ierusalem: this under no precept. No refusing to suffer, no retarding of the Gospel. The example of* Christ *and S.* Paul *at other times, the testimony of* Origen, *and confession of the Diatribist.*

1. THe 3d *instance* was taken from *Paul's* going up to *Hierusalem*, *Act.* 21. when, being told by a *Prophet* v. 11. that *bonds expected* him there, he might *lawfully* have *avoided* that danger, and gone some other *way*, and been *justified* by *Mat.* 10. 23. and yet in this *conjuncture*, when he might have *abstained*, he would yet needs *go up*, v. 13. and so that was his נדבה. Now *to this*, saith he, *the like may be answered*, viz. *that it was no free-will offering, for though by the general allowance he might have fled, yet if he should have refused to suffer, with the retarding of the Gospel, he had surely sinned.*

To this *answer* the *reply* may be brief, that *Pauls* not going to *Ierusalem* at that time, did in no wise imply either his *refusing to suffer*, or *retarding the Gospel*: 1. The *not going*, when he *knowes*, that if he goes, he shall *suffer*, is not *refusing to suffer*, it is only the *diverting* at that time, the not casting himself upon *apparent danger*, which we find sometimes exemplified by *Christ*, *Mat.* 12. 15. upon knowledge of the *Pharisees* designe to kill him, though sure he never *refused* to *suffer*, but esteemed it a *prime* part of his *mission*.

3. Upon this occasion it was * *Origens* observation, ὃ διὰ φόβον θανάτου &c. *Christ did not this for fear of death*, i. e. *refusing*, or being in the least degree *unwilling* to *suffer*, giving thereupon this *universal axiome*, οὐκ ἀγεννὲς ἐστι τὸ μετ' οἰκονομίας περιστάμενον τοὺς κινδύνους μὴ ὁμόσε αὐτοῖς χωρεῖν, *Tis no degenerous thing to avoid dangers prudently, and not to go among them.*

* Contra Cels.

4. And sure it would have been the same in S. *Paul* who was not obliged to runne into *danger* here, any more then to go unto the multitude, or into the *Theatre*, *Act.* 19. 30, 31. both which when he was willing to have done, he yet *abstained* from both, upon the *intreaty* of the *disciples*, & the *Asiarcha* that were *kind* to him,

And

And accordingly we know at other times he made use of the same *liberty*, & industriously *avoided* the *persecutors* hands, 2 *Co.* 11.33.

5. And 2. his *not going* up was no way the *retarding* the *Gospel*, only the *reserving* himself to do *Christ* more *service* upon *earth*, in preaching the *Gospel* and *confirming* the *Churches*; For of this there is no question, that the *Gospel* might be advanced by his *life*, as well as by his *death*, and as it appears in his *Epistle* to the *Philippians*, it might be better for the *Christians* committed to his charge, that he should continue to *live* and *labour among them*, and accordingly the pious *Christians* here besought him that he would not go up, and, I hope, were not guilty of *designing treachery* to the *Gospel* in so doing, and so the *Disciples*, v. 4. who had *by the Spirit*, i. e. by the gift of *prophecy* received *knowledge* of his danger, *advised* him also. Not that I think the *Spirit*, either by them, or by *Agabus*, *disswaded* his going, for then it had been an act of *obedience* to the *Spirit*, and so of *duty* not to go, but that the *Spirit* made known his *hazard*, which there he should run, leaving it *free* to him to *go*, or not to *go*, and that there were *Spiritual reasons* on *both* sides, and for *not going*, over and above, *motives* prudential, in regard of his own *safety*, and no *command* to despise these, nor consequently ground of *necessity* or *obligation* to go up, only an *intuition* of some things that seemed to be *more excellent*, *exercising* of many admirable *graces*, of *courage*, and *constancy*, and *confession* of a *persecuted Christ*, every of which received lustre from the certain *foresight* of his *danger*, and these, it seems, weighed down the *ballance* with him against all the *importunities* of his *friends*, superadded to the contrary *motives*, and accordingly he *chose* that which was most *noble*, most *excellent*, most *contrary* to *flesh* and *blood*, made not use of that *liberty* which *God* had given him, and in that respect this is directly *parallel* to the former, that of *refusing* of *hire*, μὴ καταχρησάμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, he *made not use of the power* which he had, and so still his נדבה his *voluntary*, *spontaneous oblation* of himself even to *martyrdome*, without any *command* or *obligation* for it at this time.

6. *Origen* shall conclude this, in his *Books* against *Celsus*, Κἂν φεύγῃ ὁ Χριστιανὸς, οὐ διὰ δειλίαν φεύγει· ἀλλὰ τηρῶν ἐντολὴν τοῦ διδασκάλου, καὶ ἑαυτὸν φυλάττων καθαρὸν ἑτέρων ὠφεληθησομένων τῇ σωτερίᾳ.

Though a Christian fly (and yet that is more then *not going up here*) *yet he flies not for cowardise, but observing the commandment of his Master*, (and then sure he *offends* not, much lesse *betrayes* his *Master*) *keeps himself pure, that others may be profited by his preservation*, and so still this is not the *betraying*, but rather *advancing* of the *Gospel*.

7. That there was no such *command* to S. *Paul* or *others*, *binding* to be *bound*, *beaten*, *stoned*, is here acknowledged by the *Diatribist*, and from thence I *conclude*, therefore it had not been *sin* in him *not to go* up, when he knew he should be *bound*, for *sin* is a *breach* or *transgression* of a *law*. This *Diatribist* therefore denying it to be a *free-will offering*, that he *chose* the danger, when he might have preferred his *safety*, ought in all reason to have shewed the *ground* which rendred his going *necessary*, which having not attempted to do, but only in stead of it, *affirming*, that *if he had refused with the retarding of the Gospel, he had surely sinned* (which is *equivalent to acknowledging* that his bare *not going* to *Jerusalem* had *not* been *sin*, in case it had not been (as certainly it might not have been) to the *retarding* of the *Gospel*) tis certain there remains no appearance of *reason* for his *negation*, nor consequenly of *objection* or *pretence*, why this should not be a נדבה as well as the *former*, or any thing which is most *spontaneous*.

8. The vulgar *answer* of some, that this was an *instinct* or *motion* of the *Spirit*, is not here *adhered* to by the *Diatribist*, and therefore I shall not speak to that, being also sure, that no such thing doth here appear in the *Story*, and therefore must not be supposed, without all *proof*.

See

Sect. 14.

The fourth of the more liberal almesgiving. Sadduces and Asidai. Righteousness. Mercy. Paul's *advice without command.* 2 Cor. 8.2. *The Diatribists answer satisfied. Almes the Christians sacrifice in the offertory. Allowance no command. A latitude of degrees in the middle rule. The Apostles direction of giving as God hath prospered. Of the circumstances of giving.*

1. THE fourth *instance* is in the *almesgiving* or *works* of *mercy* where the *quotum* (what *proportion of the whole every rich man should set apart for this purpose out of his yearly revenue*) *being left free, and not particularly defined by God*, there is evidently place for *voluntary oblations*, above that which is *under command* or *necessary*, as is set down undeniably in that *Tract.* §. 32.

2. To what is there said I now adde these two considerations, for the *evidencing* of it; the *first* from the very denotation of the names, *Saducai* and *Asidai* or *Esseni* among the *Iewes*: A *proportion* there was of *charity* and *liberality*, which was by *law* required of all, and this was called their צדקה *righteousnesse*, and from hence I suppose the *Sect* of the *Sadducees*, called *Tsadikim*, first derived their title, they that observed the whole *righteousnesse* of the *Law*, did all that by the *Law* they were *required* to do, and so *transgrest* not in this *respect*, But beside this, there was חֶסֶד that which exceeded this *necessary* proportion ויתרון השובה *abundance of goodnesse* or *mercy*, as hath formerly been said, and from thence the *Esseni* had their title חסדים *Chasidim* or *Asidai*, and they were supposed to have their ἐπίμετρα τοῦ νόμου, their *over-measure*, performances, *more* then the *Law exacted* from them, and so that is an *example* of what I now speak of, the *free-will* performances of *mercy*.

3. The *Second* shall be from S. *Pauls* language, 2 *Cor.* 8. 2. where speaking of the *Corinthians* equalling the *Macedonians* in *liberality* to the poor *Iewes*, he gives them no *command* to do so,

(ὃ

(οὐ κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, *I ſpeak not by way of precept*, v.8.) but only his *advice* or *opinion*, his γνώμη, juſt as in the caſe of *ſingle life*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. ἐπιταγὴν οὐκ ἔχω, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι, *I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give my advice*; And if the *Corinthians* did *obſerve* and *practiſe* according to this *advice*, if they did give in *proportion* to the *Macedonians*, or (in caſe they did not) yet ſtill the *Macedonians* themſelves, which certainly were thus *exemplarily liberal*, and that αὐθαίρετοι *of their own accord*, v.3. without any *obligation* of *precept* lying upon them, and yet farther ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, *above* what they were well able to do, are again an *inſtance* of doing more in this kind, then either *all* men at *all* times, or *they* at *thus*, were *obliged* to have done, and ſo this was a נדבה in them.

4. Now to this *inſtance* of *works* of *mercy*, he firſt reſolves, that *it may be anſwered in part, that it belongs not to the queſtion, which is of worſhip, not of actions of civil life.*] But to this I *reply*, 1. that an *anſwer in part* is no *ſatisfactory* anſwer, and ſo this profeſſing to be no *more*, needs not be *conſidered*. 2. that the *parity* of *reaſon* holds from *one* act of *Chriſtian performance* to *another*, that if in *duties* of *charity* between *fellow Chriſtians*, there may be an ὑπερέχειν τῷ νόμῳ, ſomewhat *above* the *commands* of the *law* of *Chriſt*, there may alſo by *analogy* be the ſame in matters of *Chriſtian worſhip*, there being neither *reaſon* nor *revelation* of *Chriſts* will, not yet of his *allowance*, to *one* more then to the *other*. But then 3dly This of *works* of *mercy* is generally defined to be, in a *Chriſtian* performance of it, an *act* of *worſhip*, ſet in the *front* of ſuch by *Chriſt*, *Mat* 6.1. appointed to be exerciſed on the *Lords day* (as a work of the *day*) 1 *Cor.* 16.2. and accordingly interpreted by *Chriſt* to be done to *himſelf*, *Mat.* 25.40. and ſo by S. *Paul* ſtyled θυσία and ὀσμὴ θυσίας, a *ſacrifice*, an acceptable *ſacrifice*, *Phil.*4.18. *Heb.* 13.16. And yet 4. to remove all ſcruple, I wiſh that after the cuſtome of the *Primitive Apoſtolick Church*, this *almes* be preſented to *God*, in the *offertory* at the *Sacrament*, and then, as it will certainly be a *branch* of *Chriſtian worſhip*, ſo my inſtance ſhall be ſet *particularly* to that ſort of *almes*, and it will certainly hold in that, as exactly as in any other.

5. But this *imperfect anſwer* being not confided in, he is pleaſed to *adde*

adde more, 1. That *the queſtion is not of a degree of an act of obedience, commanded, as Almes-giving is, but of the act it ſelf, if not commanded nor allowed in the ſpeciall nor in the generall.* But this anſwer cannot be of any manner of uſe to the *Diatribiſt*. For 1. The *queſtion* being certainly this, Whether *Ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* in a *Church* are *criminous*, if they be not *commanded* by *God*; and *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals*, being *geſtures* and *times*, and ſo *circumſtances* not *acts* of *worſhip*, 'tis viſible that the *queſtion* is not onely of the *act* it ſelf. 2. The *reaſon* being the ſame of *circumſtances* and of *degrees*, of one *acceſſorie* and of *another*, it follows, that if *uncommanded degrees*, may be *lawfull*, *uncommanded circumſtances* muſt be *lawfull* alſo. 3. Though *almes-giving* in *general* be *commanded*, yet as long as the *degrees* be *uncommanded*, the *argument* from the *lawfulneſs* of thoſe *degrees* will hold to the *juſtifying* of *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals*, becauſe as *almes-giving* is *commanded*, ſo *praying* to, and *praiſing* of *God* is *commanded* alſo, and theſe *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are as viſibly *circumſtances* of *prayer* and *praiſing* as theſe *degrees* are of *almes-giving*. Nay 4. To take away all *poſſibility* that this *anſwer* ſhould be uſefull to him, the *inſtance* which I ſet of *almeſgiving* is of an *uncommanded act*, for ſuppoſing the *utmoſt degree* of the *uncommanded mercy* to be once *defined* and *determined*, and ſuppoſe me to *exceed* that *proportion* in *giving*, 'tis evident that that *exceeding* is an *act* firſt, and then an *uncommanded act*; an *act*, for ſo is every *exerciſe* or *work* of *mercy*, and this *giving* is ſuch an *exerciſe*; and an *uncommanded act*, for ſo is all which is not under *precept*, and ſo this is ſuppoſed to be, and herein it is perfectly *anſwerable* to the *free-will offering* among the *Jews*; *Sacrifice* or *offering* was a *determined* and *commanded duty*, and every *exerciſe* of that, above what was *commanded*, was a *freewill oblation*, and as ſuch *accepted* by *God*; and ſo it is here.

6. As for his *cautious reſtriction* added in the cloſe of that *anſwer*, which pretends that the *queſtion* is of ſuch *acts*, which as they are *not commanded*, ſo *neither* are they *allowed in ſpecial or in general*, he muſt needs know that this is an *impoſing* on the reader; For 1. The *queſtion* being of the *lawfulneſs* of *uncommanded acts*, and *allowance*, whether *general* or *ſpecial*, being yet no *command*, for no man is *bound* to do all that he is *allowed* to do; tis evident

that the *acknowledging* the *lawfulneſs* of *allowed* acts, as they muſt needs be *lawfull*, if they be *allowed*, is the *acknowledging* the *lawfulneſs* of ſome *uncommanded* acts; for ſuch are they which are no more then *allowed*.

7. 2. For the clearing of this, I ſhall offer the *Diatribiſt* this *Dilemma*; Are theſe *high* but *uncommanded degrees* of *mercy allowed* either in *general* or *ſpecial* now under the *Goſpel*, or are they not? If they are *not*, then this *cautionary* clauſe was very *impertinently* added, and my *inſtance*, though it proceeded of *degrees* which are not thus *allowed*, yet proceeding of *degrees* which are *not commanded*, was a *valid* inſtance. But if they are *allowed*, as I ſuppoſe by his *caution* he will affirme, why then, it ſeems, there is either *general* or *ſpecial allowance* ſtill under the *Goſpel* for *uncommanded acts*, and then there is as much for them under *Chriſt*, as there was under *Moſes* for *freewill offerings*, and ſo the *Leviticalneſs* of the *freewill offerings* conſiſted not in this, that they were thus *allowed*, and then this was no part of that *Levitical Law*, nor *conſequently* of that which was *aboliſhed*, as * before he had affirmed, and ſo the *Diatribiſt's* whole *ſcheme* is demoliſhed, or rather *fallen* aſunder of its own *accord*, as all infirme *fabricks* are apt to do.

*p. 91.

8. What followes in the 2d place, as if it were an *anſwer* to the *inſtance*, is but an *attempt* or two of the *Diatribiſt's*, out of my words to gain ſome *advantage*, and thereby to *conclude* that there is ſome *middle rule that binds men ſo, as that whatſoever is more or leſs then that, offends either by way of exceſs or defect.*] But both this and all the other *artifices* were exactly *prevented* in the manner of my ſetting of the *inſtance*, of a *proportion* exceeding that, whatever it is, which can be defined our *duty*, and yet not *offending* againſt any other *ingagement* of the *givers*. For if that which is done be *more* then that which we are any way *bound* to, 'tis *impoſſible* it ſhould *tranſgreſs* in the *defect*; and yet being no way *forbidden* to give ſo *much*, not being guilty of *neglecting* any *other* part of *duty* incumbent on us, 'tis on the other ſide as *impoſſible* that there ſhould be any *exceſs*. Nay there being, in the *New Teſtament*, a viſible *allowance*, of *ſelling* all and *giving* to the *poor*, of laying that all at the *Apoſtles feet*, and S. *Paul* commending the *Macedonians* who had been ὑπὲρ

ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, *willingly liberal above their power*, 1 *Cor.*8. 3. and the like, our greateſt *liberalities*, if they be *prudently* ordered and *ſeaſonably* placed (and there is no *neceſſity*, that he that is moſt *liberal* or *merciful* ſhould be a *fool*) are competently ſecured from *offending* on *that* ſide.

9. And therefore the *Diatribiſt* that from the *poſſibility* of falling into *extremes*, was willing to collect a *middle rule*, and from thence a *debt*, ſhould in any reaſon have aſſigned that *rule*, and produced his *authority* for it in the *New Teſtament*, and then the *weakneſs* of his *anſwer* would ſoon have been viſible. For I ſhould immediately have aſſigned ſome *proportion exceeding* that *middle*, and made my *inſtance* of that, and ſo have proceeded as *formerly*. But the truth is, ſuch a middle cannot be produced; And if it cannot, then is this an *evident* proof, that there are no ſuch *middle* points *quos ultra citráque nequit conſiſtere rectum*, the *variation* from which is always *criminous*; Nay if it were not ſimply *impoſſible*, and yet *cannot eaſily* be done by *every man* for *himſelf*, or by the *teacher* for *all*, then ſtill it is evident that this *obligation* is not *univerſally revealed*, & ſo no *duty univerſally obligatorie*; and then my *inſtance* ſhall be ſet to ſuch a *perſon*, to whom it is not *obligatory*.

10. But, as I ſaid, there is no ground in the *Goſpel* for *defining* or determining the *middle rule*, which conſtitutes a *debt*. The truth is, that this *middle rule* conſiſts not in any *indiviſible* point, but in a *latitude*, wherein there are many *degrees*, but *all* within the *rule* of *allowance*, though not *all* within the *rule* of *precept*, he that *obſerves* the *duty* in any *degree* of the *latitude*, *doth well* (for if not, then that was too great *parſimonie*, and ſo no *obſervation* but a *breach* of the *rule*) and he that goes yet *farther*, but not *beyond* the *latitude*, *doth better*, for ſo he *muſt*, unleſs he go *too far*, which if he do, then he is *prodigal*, and that is a *breach* of the *rule* again on the other ſide.

11 By this it appears, that as there is *allowance* not onely for ſome one point, but for every *degree* within the *latitude*, ſo every *degree* of that *latitude* doth not *bind* every man, ſo as to make that *degree* a *debt* or *duty* in that man; No nor the *general rule* of *giving according to God's proſpering them* (the onely thing which the *Diatribiſt* hath ſtill behind) For beſides that that *rule*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. ſeems to have a *propriety* to that *particular* time in conſideration

ſideration of the *great diſtreſs* and *famine* in *Judea*, and conſequently is not a *rule* for *all* other *times*; Beſides this, I ſay, it is manifeſt, that they which do *obſerve* that *rule*, i. e. offend not in the *defect* againſt it, may yet be able to *exceed* the *proportion*, which that *rule* ſtrictly *required*, and then not onely do *well* (as they muſt, if they offend not againſt any *other rule*) but alſo do *better*, for ſuch muſt all that be, which is *more* then *well*, and yet *degenerates* not into *ill*.

12. For ſuppoſe a man, in deſire to *obſerve* that *rule* of *giving as God hath proſpered* him, to give the *tenth* of his *profits weekly* or *yearly*, and ſuppoſe him to do *well* in ſo doing, i. e. not to *offend* againſt the *rule*, as it is ſet and meant by St *Paul*, or if the *tenth* be not a fit *proportion*, let any other be *aſſigned* which is *fit*, and then ſuppoſe that man yet to give *more*, ſo that ſtill he *offend* not againſt any *other precept* by *exceſſive* giving, and then you have the *inſtance* of the נדבה the *uncommanded* yet *acceptable* work of *mercy*, ſtill the ſame, as formerly, though ſomewhat more *explicitely* ſet, and ſo a more *manifeſt* evidence, that nothing *is* by this *Diatribiſt* (I may ſay, *can be*) produced as a *valid exception* or *objection* againſt it.

13. For as to that of the *circumſtances of time and place and perſons in regard of the neceſſities of the poor*, the caſe which I ſet is not capable of thoſe *conſiderations*, my *inſtance* being not laid in any *particular almes*, terminated in a *particular perſon* (though that alſo would admit of a *latitude*, I might give *as much* as were my *duty* to that *particular perſon*, and then I might *exceed* that, give *more* to him, and that would be my נדבה) but in a *weekly* or *yearly conſecration* or ſetting apart of ſome more *liberall* proportion for *pious* and *charitable uſes*, not *foreſeeing* particularly what they are, and withall not *reſtraining* my ſelf from giving *more*, if *objects* offer themſelves to my *charity*, above what my *aſſignation* will extend to. This ſetting the caſe evidently prevents all thoſe *difficultis* ariſing from *circumſtance of time and place and perſons* by remaining abſolutely looſe and *abſtract* from *all* theſe, and thus the caſe was (and is to be) ſet, and will not doubt to ſecure it ſelf from all *objections* by this means.

Sect. 6.

Sect. 6.

The fifth inſtance vindicated. Circumſtances of Prayer acknowledged free. Difference between placing worſhip in geſtures, &c. and pleaſing God by them. So in Feſtivals,

1. MY *fift inſtance* was in *ſecret prayer*, 1. of the *adjoining bodily worſhip* to it, any ſuch as is moſt *humble*, and yet not *under command*, as *proſtration* &c: 2. of the *frequence* of it, *ſeven times a day*, with *David*, or ſome other *proportion above* that which is by the *evangelical law* ſuppoſeable to be required of us. To this he anſwers briefly, that *Prayer indeed is a worſhip of God, but for the manner, geſtures, times, frequency, they are not properly worſhip, but circumſtances, rites*, &c. *left to the liberty of every perſon, and ſo though free, not parts of worſhip.*
2. This *anſwer* is very *brief* indeed, but needed not to have been *larger*, being in theſe few words a *yielding* of the whole *cauſe*; For is it not *evident*, that if *geſtures* and *times* be *free*, then *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are ſo too, and if they are, then are they *lawful* at once and *uncommanded*, for *freedome* comprehends both thoſe being *free* to be *done* and ſo *lawful*, free to be left *undone*, and ſo *uncommanded*. I need adde no more, ſure, of that.
3. What followes in that §. is on purpoſe deſigned to involve this *plain* matter, and reduce it into an *intricacy*: And the way to do it is to *confound* or *ſhuffle* together, theſe *two* things, *placing the worſhip of God in them, and pleaſing God by them.* But to this I anſwer, that theſe are *two diſtant* things, and ſo in all reaſon to be *ſevered*. He that *juſtifies* or *defends* the *uſe* of the *humbleſt geſtures* in the *ſervice* of *God*, and affirms them to be more *acceptable* to *God*, then either the *leſſe humble geſtures*, or thoſe which have no *humility* at all in them, doth not yet place *worſhip* in them but willingly acknowledges that *God* may be *worſhipt* without them.
4. So he again that undertakes the *defending* of other *Feſtivals annually* commemorative of the *birth* and *aſcenſion* of *Chriſt*, &c. beſide the *weekly commemoration* of the *reſurrection*, and affirms it to be *acceptable* to *God* that we obſerve theſe alſo, and that the *thankful pious* obſervation thereof is more *acceptable* to

God

God then the *contrary* whether *negligence* or *contumacy*, doth not yet *place* the *worship* of *God* in these *Festivals*, but in the *prayer* and *thanksgiving* which are offered to *God* in those *Festivals*. And the same will certainly hold in all other *particulars*, to which either the *Treatises* arraigned by this *Diatribist*, or this *defence* have attempted to *extend* it. Such are the *frequent*, *daily*, and *constant houres* of *prayer*, either *publick*, or *private*, supposing as still I do, that they do not *interfere* with, or *supplant* any other *duty*. or run out all into *formality*, &c.

5. Of this last *frequency* of *Prayer*, he would fain perswade us that it is not a חובה (but a *debt*) and to that end tells us first of *pray continually*, that *the scope of it is to command frequent prayer every day*, and 2. that *it hath respect to the frequent occasions and necessities of men every day, and so bindes to pray as oft as need shall be, with ejaculatory prayers at least.* And yet in the *midst* of this, speaking of the *particular* number of 7 times a *day*, he is content to acknowledge it true what I say, *i.e.* that it is *no debt*. And if so, then is that all that I contend for, supposing a man to *pray* as oft as that *precept* [*Pray continually*] obligeth, & withal to use *ejaculatory prayers* as need shall be, and yet farther to have more *frequent daily returns* to the *solemn* performance of that *duty*, then that *precept* is pretended to *require*, then still this is under no *precept*, and yet no doubt *acceptable*, and so still as exact a חובה as could be pitcht on.

Sect. 7.

Of the difference betwixt a precept and a grace. The proportionable return to grace is in a latitude. The highest no excesse. A possibility for grace to be given in vain.

1. HIS next branch of discourse is designed to discover my *mistake* in making the difference so great betwixt a *precept* and a *grace*. And my setting down of that *difference* consisting of many *degrees*, of which each *superaddes* to the former, and not any *one* single, but *all* taken together are a perfect *stating* of it, the *Reader* is desired to review the whole matter §.39. and by so doing he will soon finde that every of the *Diatribists objections* to the former

former degrees, was perfectly *prevented* and *anſwered* in the *following*, ſave only the *laſt* of them, and therefore that only remains to be now *examined*.

2. The *objection* is p. 103. that *ſure as grace it ſelf, ſo any meaſure or degree of grace being a talent alſo, requires a proportionable return to that degree, as to whom more is given, of him is more required.* But to this alſo my *anſwer* hath formerly been *intimated*, viz. that as in the *middle rule* of *almes-giving* there is a *latitude*, ſo here in the *proportionable* return to any *degree* of *grace*, this *proportionable* return is not ſo placed in any *indiviſible* point, that as he that comes ſhort of that point *offends* in the *defect*, ſo the *exceeding* that point in the leaſt degree ſhall be an *offence* alſo, but, as I ſaid, in a *latitude*, wherein there may ſtill be a *variation*, and yet all the *degrees* of that within the *latitude*.

And therefore as it may be true of two men that have the ſame *grace* in *ſpecie*, that both may uſe it *well*, and yet one make *better* uſe of it then another, ſo it is ſuppoſeable of the ſame *degree* of the ſame *grace*, for though to that *degree* of *grace*, there be ſome *degree* alſo of *return* proportioned, that who ſo fails in that, *offends* by *defect*, yet it doth not follow from thence, that whoſo *exceeds* that *minimum quod ſic*, that *leaſt degree* that was proportionable, ſhall preſently *offend* by way of *exceſſe*, but indeed the *contrary* will be moſt viſible, that he that thus *exceeds* is more *acceptable* and more highly *rewardable*.

3. He that had *ten talents* intruſted to him to *occupy* withal, and having *gained* other *ten*, was *accepted* and *rewarded*, had he been yet *more* induſtrious, and brought in his *Maſter* more *profit*, gained *eleven* or *twelve talents* by thoſe *ten*, tis not imaginable but this would have been *acceptable* alſo to his *Lord*, and yet more highly *rewardable*.

4. Paul *laboured more abundantly then all the Apoſtles*, and this *by the grace of God that was in him*, and by ſome *eminent meaſure* of that *grace*, and ſuppoſing that *meaſure* to have been no *greater* in him then it was either in *John* or *Peter*, yet would this certainly have been *accepted* by *God*, and more richly rewarded, and not uſed like the *giants* on *Procuſtis* his bed, all the *exuberance* cut off and caſt away, I mean required to come down to that *lower* degree of *return*, which either of thoſe other *diſciples* did make, or

to

to *loſe* his *reward* of that *higher* degree. And ſo this is full *anſwer* to all his *exceptions* againſt the *difference* by me aſſigned between *Precept* and *Grace*.

6. As for his *incidental* wonder at my *expreſſion* when I ſaid [*it is the deſigne of grace only to ſtrengthen and incline, which he that makes uſe of as he ſhould, is promiſed a reward*] upon which he cries out, *This is ſtrange divinity, doth God give grace only to ſtrengthen and incline, and leave men free to uſe it or not to uſe it? ſo grace might be given in vain.*] To this I briefly *anſwer*, 1. from the words of *Scripture*, *Heb.* 12.28. that men are exhorted to have *grace*, i. e. I ſuppoſe to make uſe of it, as when *to him that hath*, *Chriſt* promiſeth it *ſhall be given, and he ſhall have abundance*, tis evident it ſignifies, to him that makes *uſe* of the *grace* which he hath, and certainly that *exhortation* were in vain, if the contrary were not *poſſible*, and ſo likewiſe when he which *hath not* (makes not *due uſe* of it) is threatned with the *auferetur, & ejicietur, taking away from him his talent, and caſting him into utter darkneſſe*, ſure tis ſuppoſed *poſſible*, that ſome man may not make *uſe* of his *talent*, or elſe theſe *threatnings* muſt be in vain, or men both *deprived* and *caſt* out without any *demerit*.

7. Again, doth not the *Apoſtle* exhort, that we *receive not the grace of God in vain*, that we *grieve not*, *quench not* (as elſewhere there is mention of *reſiſting*) *the Spirit*? Doth he not tell us of ſome that did *abuſe the grace of God unto wantonneſſe*? and *can* none of theſe be done? Is it not *poſſible*, through our own *corruption* and *ſinful* negligence and default, to *reſiſt*, to *grieve*, to *quench* the *ſpirit*, be it of *prayer*, of *faith*, of *charity* &c. to *abuſe it to wantonneſſe*, or not to *uſe* it through *idleneſſe*? What then is the meaning of *laying up the talent in the napkin*, that was ſo puniſht? Did not he *receive* the *talent*, the *grace in vain*?

8. But as generally it falls out, that thoſe that reprehend this kind of *Divinity* moſt demurely, if they be a while *obſerved*, need no other *evidence* to confute them but what their own words will yield us they that leave nothing to mans *will*, do yet often *exhort* and *reprehend* men, which muſt certainly be *vain* and *ridiculous*, unleſſe they that are exhorted be in ſome poſſibility by *Gods grace* to do what they are *exhorted* to do, and they that are *reprehended*

in

in the ſame poſſibility to have done otherwiſe; ſo hath it happened to this *Diatribiſt*; He that juſt now thought the *Divinity* ſo *ſtrange*, that *grace* might be *given in vain*, addes in the very next words that S. *Matthew* ſaith, *take him and caſt him into utter darkneſs for not uſing his talent*, which certainly is that identical *ſtrange* thing, with *grace being given him in vain*, as to all *fruit*, or *uſe* he made of that *grace*. And in the very next words again he addes, *Is he not threatned with loſs of his talent for not uſing it?*

9. But tis poſſible the *ſtrange divinity* here cenſured, may have been ſomewhat elſe, not my ſuppoſing that it was left *phyſically free* or *poſſible* for man to *uſe* or *not* to *uſe grace*, but that it was *morally free*, i. e. *lawful*, or that which included no *ſin*, and then *Gods not giving of grace in vain*, muſt be his not *giving* it ſo as that it ſhall be no *ſin not* to *uſe* it; And if that be his meaning, then, as his *expreſſions* were very *ſtrange*, much more then my *divinity*, ſo *ſtrange* that I, whoſe *divinity* it was, could not underſtand it, as it was thus *diſguiſed* by him, (for who would ſay that to *give grace* without any *deſigne* of laying *obligation ſub periculo animæ* to make *uſe* of it, were to *give grace in vain?* Is there no other *poſſible uſe* of *grace* but to *condemn* them, and render them *unexcuſable?* this indeed is another branch of no very old *Divinity*, though theſe daies have not made it *ſtrange* with ſome men) ſo I ſuppoſe I have already given *anſwer* to this in the former part of this §. and muſt not now ſo ſoon *repeat* it.

10. The ſhort is, though *grace* bring *obligation* with it, and that to ſome *return proportionable* to that *grace*, yet ſtill this *proportionable return* conſiſts in a *latitude*, which hath ſeveral *degrees* in it, and as the loweſt of theſe are under *obligation*, ſo the *ſuperior* are not, but yet ſuch as will be *accepted* and *rewarded* by *God*, to him that *arrives* to them. And ſo much for that of the *difference* between the *grace* and *precept*, which he thought would have yielded him ſo great *advantage*.

Sect. 8.

My answer to a first head of objections vindicated. Prudence lost by mans own sin receverable by grace. The punishments of Adams *sin are not our faults. Perfection of innocence capable of degrees. So perfection of the Judaical law, and of the Christian. So mercifulness to ability.* Τῶν δυναμιν ἀυδαιρετοι 2 Cor. 8.3. *Merciful as God is merciful belongs not to the degree. Gods righteousnesse punishes not where there is no law. Intuition of reward in Christian performances, no Popery. Proofs of this from Scripture, from the nature of Hope, Faith, Gratitude. Not alwayes prudent to undertake the highest. Martyrdome no conceited Popish perfection, yet under no precept to all. S.* Hieroms *words examined. Two notions of the word Perfection. Some perfection possible in this life, and yet capable of growth. The law, as it signifies the condition of the first Covenant, is not now in force with believers. Of Christs perfecting the law. Every man is not bound to do what is best.* 1 Cor. 7.38. καλῶς ποιεῖ *of moral good. The saying of* Gregory *explicated.*

1. WHat remains now in that *Tract* of *Will-worship*, was by me added for the *preventing* of *mistakes*; To which end *three* heads of *objections* I proposed, the *first* arising from the *obligation* that *prudence* seems to lay upon us to do alwaies that which is *fittest* and *best*, the *second* from the *general precept* of *loving the Lord with all the heart*, &c. the *third* from the seeming *favourableness* of our *doctrine* to the *Romanists works of supererogation*, & to each of these I gave particular answers, which must be viewed in that *Tract* from §. 40. to the end. And to these *answers*, what he now opposes, I shall now examine κατὰ πόδα.

2. And first, saith he, *Every man is bound to be prudent to that degree of prudence which he lost by sin.* To this I answer, that if he speak of the mans *own actual sins*, whereby he hath any way

way *infatuated* himſelf, there is then truth in his affirmation; but tis not appliable to the matter in hand, *viz.* to ſuch an high *degree* of *prudence* as now I ſpeak of, for of that he may come ſhort, without any *degree* of *actual ſin* as ſhall thus infatuate and deprive him of *prudence*; and beſides, ſpeaking, as I do, of a *pious, merciful,* and ſo of a *regenerate man,* I may ſuppoſe him by the *inlightning* wiſe *Spirit* of *God* returned to that ſtate of *prudence* from which his *own actual* ſins may have *degraded* him, & in caſe he be ſo, then, as he is as *prudent* as by this rule of the *Diatribiſts* thus underſtood he is bound to be, ſo certainly he is yet capable of *growing* in that, as in other *graces*, and ſo of being yet *more prudent*, and if he do ſo, and thereby obey that *exhortation* of S. *Peters, Grow in grace and in the knowledge*—— he is ſtill free from ſin in this reſpect, though he have not yet arrived to the higheſt *degree* of *prudence* that *humane*, but *lapſt nature* is capable of.

3. But if by *ſin* he means not *actual* but *original ſin*, and ſo thinks that every man is bound to be *prudent* to that *degree* of *prudence* that *Adam* loſt by his *fall*, this ſure will be found to be a *miſtake*; For this loſſe of *Adams* was a *puniſhment* of *Adams ſin*, and when it is inflicted by *God* on his poſterity, muſt be lookt on as a *puniſhment*, and he that is *puniſht* cannot be obliged *not* to be *puniſht*. No man is now obliged to be as *prudent* as *Adam* was in his *integrity* any more then to be as *healthy*, i. e. in effect to be *immortal*, Nay ſuppoſing *Adam* to have *ſinned*, and ſo to have *tranſgreſt* the *Law* in that, it cannot be imagined, that it is over and above that, a *new* or *further* act of *ſin* in him to be leſſe *knowing*, *prudent*, or *healthy*, then he was; all theſe, without any new act of his *will*, nay contrary thereto, falling upon him by *Gods decree* or punitive *juſtice*; and if it were not *ſin* in *Adam* himſelf, then ſure it cannot be ſuch in his *poſterity*, and ſo a man now, one of his *poſterity*, cannot be bound to that *degree* of *prudence* which *Adam* once had, any more then to be *born* in the ſtate of *innocence* and *perfection*, when yet he is neceſſarily ſuppoſed to be *born* after the *image* of the *lapſt imperfect Adam*, which he could not be, if he were born in this *perfection*.

4. And when in the ſame place he adds, that *every man is bound to be pious in the higheſt degree*, proving it by this, that *the law requires*

perfection of holiness, and the Gospel (saith the Doctor) yet greater perfection, and every man is bound to be merciful to his ability, as our heavenly Father is merciful (which sure is the highest degree) this is but an heap of *paralogismes*, no one of the proofs belonging to the *highest degree* of *piety* or *mercy*, which was the one thing which was to be inferred from them.

5. For 1. the *perfection* of *holyness* which the *law* required, was but either *sincere* and *upright*, or at the most but *unsinning obedience*, and neither of those includes the *highest degree* of *piety*, which is possible.

6. If by the *law* be meant the *Covenant* made with *Adam* in *innocence*, then indeed tis true that the *perfection* which that required was *unsinning obedience*, and if *Adam* had performed that, tis yet evident that he had been capable of *higher degrees* of *piety* then that *law* required, there being in *unsinning obedience*, a *latitude*, and so many *degrees*, of which the *lowest* denominates it *unsinning*, and so *perfect* in that sense, and all the superior degrees are *additions*, and to each of those *highest* the *Law* cannot be thought to *binde* when it is *satisfied* with the *lowest*.

7. This will be plain by the *instances* formerly given of *frequency* in *prayer* &c. wherein it is visible that *Adam* in *innocence* might have exceeded any proportion which *Gods law* will be supposed to have required of him; And in a word, if *Adam* had never sinned, yet might his state have been a *state* of *proficiency*, by which it is evident that the *perfection required* of him was not the *highest degree* of *piety*, for then he had sinned by any *lower*, and so *innocence* and *growth* in him had been *incompetible*; Beside, there is no reason to doubt but that *Adam* and his *posterity* should have been *rewarded according to their works*, and so have been capable of *different degrees* of *rewards*; in case they had continued in *innocence*, which yet had been impossible if every man had been bound to be *pious* in the *highest degree*, and had *sinned* as oft as he did not *arrive* to it.

8. But this is but *speculation*; & by the *law* I rather suppose he meant the *law* of the *Jews*, & then the *perfection* of *holiness* wch that *required* must, I suppose, signify *truth* & *sincerity* of *holyness*, such as was in *Zac. Lu.* 1. 6. & in respect of which he was said to be *just* & *blameless in all the Commandments of the Lord*—Now tis as certain that this

this *perfection* is as capable of *degrees* alſo, and that all that are thus *perfect*, are not yet ſo in the *higheſt*, or in the *ſame degree*, Tis certain *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* were both thus *perfect*, but no way *probable* that they were arrived *juſt* to the *ſame degree* of it, one might very reaſonably be deemed to *excell* the other.

9. This may appear of the *Judaical Law* by that which we have oft cited out of the *Law*, that there was one *degree* of *mercy* which was called צדקה their *righteouſneſs*, that to which they were *obliged* by the *Law*; another ſtyled חסד *abundance* or *excellence* of *goodneſs*, χρησότης, ἀγαθότης, wch the *Law* did not *command*, *ſub periculo animæ*, *require* or *exact* from them: This is ſo plain I need ſay no more of it.

10. *Secondly*, That *greater perfection*, which *Chriſt* required, is yet but a *higher degree* of the ſame *perfection*, but not the *higheſt* that is poſſible; Suppoſe there be *eight degrees* as of *heat* in *nature*, ſo of *zeal* or *piety*, or *perfection*, and ſuppoſe a *Jew* required to have ſo many of them as would denominate him *perfect*, i.e. at leaſt *five* of them, and a *Chriſtian* to have more then a *Jew*, ſuppoſe *ſix*, yet 'tis viſible that he that hath all that is *required* of a *Chriſtian*, is yet *capable* of having *more*, then is ſo *required*, viz. *ſeven*, & yet not to arrive to the *higheſt* that is *poſſible*, i.e. to the 8. *degree*

11. But beſide this, there is in every ſuch *degree* a *latitude* alſo, and in it as it were *fractions*, of each *degree* (and all this *ſubdiviſion* little enough to bear *proportion* with the great *difference* of the works of *pious* men here, or with the *difference* of the *degrees* of their *glory* hereafter) and he that hath the *loweſt fraction* of the *ſixt degree*, hath the *ſixt degree*, but not in ſo *high* a *meaſure*, as he that attaineth to an *higher*, viz. to the *ſeventh degree*, or to another *fraction* of the *ſixt*, and ſo 'tis evident in the *hypotheſis* or *application*, that every *Chriſtian* may be obliged to *exceed* a *Jew* in *piety*, *mercy* &c. and yet nothing hinder but that one *Chriſtian* may *exceed* another in *every* of theſe.

12. *Thirdly*, Though every man be *bound* to be *mercifull* to his *ability*, yet 1. That *mercifulneſs* which is according to *ability* is not placed in any *indiviſible point*; Two men that have the ſame *abilities*, and the ſame *opportunity* and *occaſion* requiring *mercy* from them, may very lawfully give or be *merciful* one *more* then another; For ſuppoſing any ſumme that in all thoſe *circumſtances both* are *bound* to give, yet certainly one may *lawfully exceed* that

summe give *more* then he was thus *obliged*, and yet not do beyond his ability; and 2. In case he do yet give more, even *beyond* his *ability*, i. e. deny himself lawfull *injoyments* on purpose to inable himself for this *higher* liberality, yet sure this will not be *sinfull* in him, but on the contrary more *acceptable* and *commendable*, as it was in the *Macedonians*; of whom St *Paul* testifies that they were κατὰ δύναμιν ἀυθαίρετοι thus *liberall of their own accord beyond their power*, and as such are proposed for an *example* to the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. 8. 3.

13. *Lastly*, The *precept* of being *mercifull as our heavenly Father is mercifull*, is not (the *Diatribist* well knows) applicable to the *degree* of *mercy* which is in *God*, for *finite* creatures cannot attain to that but onely to the *kind* of it, mercy to *enemies* as well as *friends*, and so could not with any colour be brought for a proof of his *objection*. And indeed after all this the *Diatribist* hath let fall a few words in the close of this 4th §. which shew he had no *belief* in the *force* of it, For having set the case so as is the most for his advantage that he could wish, all circumcumstances so concurring that a *man should be bound to give so much as will supply anothers wants, and to give less were neither prudent nor pious*, yet he dares not pronounce it an *offence* against either of those *virtues*, to go beyond this, but breaks off abruptly with these words [*whatever it were to give more*] From which *in confidence* of his I shall not doubt to infer, that in that very case, so clothed with all those *circumstances*, he cannot *deny*, but that as I am bound to supply his present wants, so I may make provision also against his *future necessities*, and be far from *sinning*, do that which is more *acceptable* to *God* in so doing.

14. His *next* return to a 2^d *degree* of my answer, is taken from his old *Topick*, of *virtues consisting in a middle point between two extremes, from which if it swerve to either extreme it is a fault though not observed, perhaps observable by men, yet justly punishable by a righteous God*. But to this though much might be said afresh, from the *consideration* of that *righteousness* of *God*, which doth not use to *punish* those *facts* which have no *Law observable* by *man* to *forbid* them, but first *shews* men his *will*, and what is *good*, and then *requires obedience* to it, yet because so much hath already been said both to that of all *virtues* being placed

placed in the *middle*, and to the *latitude* and not *indiviſible point* of that *middle*, I ſhall not now give farther *reply* to that; Any more then to the next branch of it, of *prudence* in our *created nature*, requiring to do what was *fitteſt*, for to that I have ſpoken already in this §.

15. Under this head of *prudence*, one farther degree of *objection*, I foreſaw, *viz.* that *Prudence knowing the greateſt perfection to be moſt gloriouſly rewarded, would bind a man to aſpire to perfection, and not to content himſelf with any thing but the beſt.* Upon the firſt ſight of theſe words the *Diatribiſt* is ſtartled, and *diſclaimes* making any ſuch *objection*. But to this I anſwer, that he well knows I had no *intelligence* with him, and conſequently could not *divine* his pleaſure, but as well as I could propoſed all *objections* I foreſaw *poſſible* from him, or any man elſe, of the moſt *different* perſwaſions.

16. But then till he ſhall pleaſe to propoſe *other* which have more *force* in them (as all this while he hath not *propoſed* any, but ſuch as thoſe from the 2d *Commandment*) I might expect that this my *ſervice* ſhould not be ſo very *ill* interpreted and *faſtidiouſly* caſt off, with a [*we ſhould not have framed ſuch an objection.*]

17. The crime which was thus to be *averted*, was it ſeems, a *leaven* of *Popery*, in thoſe words wherein I had propoſed the *objection*; And 1. If it were ſo indeed, I wonder, what *error* I had *committed*, or why *Papiſts* may not be permitted to make *objections*, or how the *Diatribiſt* came to have the *monopoly* of making them. But then 2. What was the *ſuſpicious phraſe* which I had uſed? Why forſooth, that I mentioned *glorious rewarding*, *This*, ſaith he, *ſeems at firſt ſight to touch upon the mercenary and meritorious way of Romaniſts.*

18. This is not to the buſineſs in hand, yet I cannot but make ſome *ſtay*, and behold this *rarity*. For 1. Is the *mercenary way* all one with the *Romaniſts doctrine* of *merits*? If it be, it is to be feared, that *David* was a *Romaniſt*, for certainly he affirmes it of *God*, that he *rewardeth every man according to his works*, even when he *deprecates* the *mercy* and *free grace* of *God*, and makes this the prime *evidence* of it that he thus *rewards* men. Nay what is *Chriſt* when he minds them of their *great reward in heaven* that *ſuffer* for him, *Mat.* 5. 12. That *give*, and *pray* in *ſecret*,

Mat.

Mat. 6. 2. 5. of a *prophets reward* and a *righteous mans reward*, *Mat.* 10. 41. and of S^t. *Paul* of ſuch works peculiarly as were not *under precept*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 18. and a multitude of the like nature every where in the *Scripture*? Is not this *reward*, *merces*, and is not all that *obedience* which is performed in *intuition* of the *glory which ſhall be reveáled*, this very *mercenary* way? and being ſo, is it preſently the *meritorious* way of the *Romaniſts*; Is there not *merces ex pacto*, *reward by the tenure* of *Chriſts promiſe*, as well as *merit* either of *congruity* or *condignity*; and is it as *unlawfull* to look at and expect the performance of *Gods promiſe*, as to challenge *heaven* as the *merit* of our *works*?

19. Again, hath not *Chriſt* propoſed his *rewards* on purpoſe to allure us to *come* unto him? and is it not *lawfull* for us to *come* that very *way* which *God* hath *called* us? Is not *hope* a *Goſpell grace*, and ſuch as ſets us a *purifying*, 1 *Joh.* 3. 3. and is not the *future reward* the object of that *hope*, and ſo that which regularly ſets a *Chriſtian* about his *work*? Nay is not that *Faith* which *juſtifies*, in this *Diatribiſt's* opinion, the *belief* of the *promiſes*? and may not a *Chriſtian* then *look* at thoſe *promiſes*, which yet he muſt *believe*?

20. But, ſaith he, *he muſt firſt look on the commands of God, and beauty of holineſs, and ſeek that firſt for it ſelf*, and by and by, *it is but carnal prudence, adviſing onely or firſt to look at the perfection of glory*. But to this I anſwer, 1. That the forme of my *objection* was not ſuch as ſuppoſed *prudence* to look either *onely* or *firſt* on *glory*, but on the *greateſt perfection* (of *virtue* here) as the *way* to the moſt *glorious reward* (hereafter) And therefore to inſert the word [*onely*] was that to which he had no kind of *temptation*.

21. Nay for the *priority* of order, looking *firſt* on the *reward*, it is viſible that I had not given the leaſt *intimation* of it, but contrariwiſe I had ſaid diſtinctly, that *prudence would adviſe to aſpire to perfection*, and to the *beſt*, meaning evidently the *perfection* of *virtue* (not of *glory*) to which the moſt *glorious reward* was proportioned. And yet after all this, ſuppoſe I had ſpoken of ſome man (in my objection) who *looks firſt* at the *perfection* of *glory*, and in order to that *laſt* end, purſues *virtue* as the one *way* to it, could he juſtly ſay this were *carnal prudence* in him and *ſinfull*?

The

22. The *beauty* of *holyneſs* is a thing ſeldom diſcerned but by the *experience* and *practice* of it, and in that caſe ſure there is need of *promiſes* to *excite* and *attract* to that *practice* (yea and of *terrors* to *drive*) and the *Goſpel* makes uſe of both theſe, and ſo doth *Faith*, which is the *Spiritual*, not *carnal prudence*. And indeed, if the *beauty* of *holyneſs* may firſt be lookt on, and that is one *promiſe*, but that a leſſe *perfect* one and to be injoyed in this *life*, then why may not the πλειοσις or *eternal reward*, which is alſo the *beauty* of *holyneſs*, and that a *perfect beauty*, a *purity* from *ſin*, as well as *immunity* from *burthens* and *miſeries*, a wiping away *ſpots*, as well as *tears*, be *firſt lookt* on alſo.

22. Briefly I ſhall demand of the *Diatribiſt*, whether *gratitude* in a *regenerate* man who hath received from *Chriſt* the great *benefits* of *election* and *redemption* and *juſtification*, may not be allowed to incite and ſtir up *duty*? If it may, I demand again, whether the reward decreed to him in his *election* be not *lookt* on by him, and whether that do not *excite* this *gratitude*? If it do, whether this be a *carnal gratitude*, and the *mercenary* way of the *Romaniſts*?

23. But I muſt not allow my ſelf farther to *expatiate* on ſuch *digreſſions*: The *Diatribiſts* divinity in this point is but ſuitable to what formerly he gave us a taſte of, in the paſſage of *ſlaviſh fear*, and both together are exemplified to us by the *woman* that went about the *city* with a *firebrand* in *one hand*, and *a baſon of water* in the *other*, ſaying, that one was to *burn* up *heaven*, and the other to *quench* the *fire* of *hell*, that neither *hope* nor *fear*, *promiſes*, nor *terrors* might have the leaſt *influence* on her, but pure *ethereal love* do the whole work. And all that I ſhall need adde, is only this, that ſtill there is an *heaven* and *hell* in *Scripture* (and all *duty* is not quite *rarified* and *converted* into this *love*) and many good *Chriſtians* there are, which make uſe of *both* theſe, and offend againſt no *precept* of *Chriſt* in doing ſo.

24. But I have at large handled this point of *looking* at the *promiſes* in our *obedience*, not only in a *Sermon* on 1 *Cor.* 7. 1. but more punctually in an *addition* to the *Pract. Catech.* now in the *Preſs*, p. 416. &c. and ſo ſhall not here any farther *inlarge* upon it.

25. My anſwers there to the forementioned *objection* are fitter for

the *Diatribist* to combat with. I proceed therefore to consider what *replies* he makes to them.

26. To my *first answer*, which was this, *That though prudence doth advise to this of aspiring to perfection, yet doth it not lay any command, so as not to obey is will be presently sinful*] (a thing which had oft been *proved* formerly, by the example of S. *Pauls advises* when he had no *commands*, for sure *Prudence* may well imitate S. *Paul* herein, and do so too) To this I say, he *replies* by bare *affirming* but not *proving* or offering the least *proof* for the *contrary*, only when he mentions the *perfection* of *virtue*, he addes [*required by the commands of God*] as if the *highest degree* of *virtue* were *under command*, which he knowes is the thing which through this whole debate is *denied* by me, and the *proofs* and *reasons* of my denying it given at large, and then what a *begging* of the *question* is it to affirm it here, without any tender or *overture* of *probation?*

27. To my *second answer* then, which was by considering the *want* of *strength* in some men, which makes it not *prudent* in them to *undertake the steep way of the greatest perfection*, founded in the words of *Christ, He that can receive it, let him receive it*,] He *replies* by asking *what perfection I mean which will be dangerous to undertake as a steep way? that which is required in the commandments of the Law and Gospel?*] I answer, twere a *contradiction* and *madness* in me, when I speak of *perfection*, which is *not* under *command*, to mean that which is *required* in the *commandments*, It is certain I mean *uncommanded degrees* of *virtue*, the undertaking those *courses* be it of *virginity, austerities, abundant labourings, Martyrdome* it self, when either I am not competently furnished with *strength* from *God* for the going through with them, or have not any *reason* to perswade my self that I shall be so *furnished*. For then, if indeed I have not *strength*, the very undertaking such heights may prove *treacherous* and *precipitious* to me. And that this is my meaning, he at last takes notice, and fills his *margent* with *proofs* of it, both from this, and from another *Tract*, and when he hath taken all that *pains* to *finde* out my *meaning* (which I professe to be it, and thought it had been *obvious* to any man before) he fairly takes his *leave* of it again, hath nothing to say to it, but returns to that perfection of

holyness

holyneſs which, ſaith he, *is the duty of all*, and all that I need return to him, is this, that if it be ſo, it is not that perfection I ſpeak of *viz. virginity*, &c. for that, I hope is not every mans duty, but at at the utmoſt his, who *can receive it.*

28. This he is reſolved not to take notice of, and accordingly proceeds, and when I ſay, that *even the precept of God may ſometimes interpoſe and make it unlawful for us to aſpire to the moſt perfect ſtate* (meaning evidently *virginity*, *martyrdome*, &c.) he ſaith *this is as ſtrange* (and again in the rear, by way of *exclamation*, *What ſtrange divinity is this!*) demanding *whether Gods precepts croſs one another*—— when he cannot but ſee that my whole *diſcourſe* and *proceſs* is founded in the ſuppoſition of that *evident* truth, that theſe ſtates of *perfection* are not under any *precept* of *Gods*, and ſo that the *precept* which ſhall *croſs* the *undertaking* of them, is far from *croſſing* any *precept* of *God.*

29. After this repeated *exclamation* and *wonderment*, he is content at length, as he ſaith, to *hear me ſpeak and explain my ſelf.* And my *explanation* being by ſuppoſition of a *duty* of our *calling awaiting us on the one ſide, and an opportunity of martyrdome* on the other, and that *exemplified* by S. *Cyprian's* caſe, that then *obedience* is better then the *richeſt ſacrifice*] here he findes place for *triumph* and *ovation. By this tis evident*, ſaith he, *he means not perfection of holineſs according to the commandments of God, but a conceited perfection of martyrdome, as Papiſts do.*

30. That I who ſpeak through that whole *Tract* of *uncommanded acts*, ſhould not mean that *perfection* which is *according to* (as that ſignifies *required by*) *the Commandments of God*, is too evident to be any *ſpecial ἔυρημα* or *diſcovery* at this time, now toward the *concluſion* of his *view* of that *Diſcourſe.* Of that therefore he hath my *free confeſſion*; But if by *perfection according to the Commandments* he will allow me to mean (as the words literally import) that *ſort* and *degree* of *perfection* which the *Commandments* of the *Goſpel allow* of very well, though they *require* it not of every man, or lay it under *precept*, then I ſhall not doubt to approve the *perfection* which I inſtance in, *viz.* that of *martyrdome*, to be ſuch, (unleſs when ſome diſcharge of known *duty* or yet *greater good* calls us another way) and if this be the doctrine of *Papiſts*, I hope yet that all *Proteſtants* are not therefore bound to *diſclaim*

it, I never heard that our *old Engliſh reformation*, which I thought had been ſealed by the blood of many *martyrs*, had lookt on *martyrdome* as a *conceited Popiſh perfection*, And if this be the *privilege* of the preſent *deformation* to exclude *martyrdome* out of the *catalogue* of *virtues*, as the *Martyrs* and *Saints* out of our *Calendars*, if this *Diatribiſt* be now one of that *Triumphant Church*, which hath thrown all *croſs* from their *ſhoulders*, and diſclaimed all *pretenſions* to this *conceited perfection*, and reſolved all to be *Papiſts* which ſhall thus *communicate* with the *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*, and obſerve this *conformity* with the *image* of *Gods ſon*, *Rom.* 8. I ſhall only tell him that I ſhall be very well pleaſed to be *guilty* of this piece of *Popery*, and to ſuffer from this ſword of the *tongue* till *God* pleaſe to call me to any higher tryals: Meanwhile when the *Apoſtle* and the *Church* which hath tranſcribed his ſtyle, have uſed the phraſe πλειοῦσθαι διὰ παθημάτων *being perfected by ſufferings*, and called *martyrdome* πλείωσις *perfection*, I cannot retract that ſtyle, what *envy* ſoever fall on me for the uſing it.

31. What now followes in purſuit of this matter, *Does God call all men at all times to martyrdome? Is there any command for all men to be martyred* &c.] is directly the evincing my *aſſertion* againſt himſelf, for upon that very *foundation* it is that I *ſuperſtruct*, therefore *Martyrdome* which is the higheſt *degree* of *perfection*, is not under any command, *Quod erat demonſtrandum*.

32. In my *third anſwer*, which was, that *perfection here had degrees in it*, and conſequently *ſuppoſing men bound to be perfect*, *Mat.* 5. 48. yet it followes not that they are *bound to the higheſt degree of perfection*) his anſwer is, *he will grant this, and yet deny my voluntary oblations ſtill*,] But how can that be, when that *higher degree* of *perfection* is ſuppoſed to be under *no precept*, and ſo to be *free*, and ſo when arrived to, a *voluntary oblation*? But his *grant*, it ſeems was only *conditional*, for it followes in his words [*For we ſay there are degrees of, or rather to perfection here, upon condition that he will grant that every degree, even the higheſt, is required by the law of God, and what is ſhort of that higheſt is ſo far culpable*] This *condition* I confeſſe I cannot perform, and ſo muſt loſe the *advantage* of his *grant*, And truly to *require* it of me is to *grant* my *premiſes*, and *require* me to *renounce* my *concluſion*

cluſion, For from that *conceſſion*, that there are *degrees* in *perfection*, and there may be *perfection*, where yet there is not the *higheſt degree* of *perfection*, it infallibly follows, that the *higheſt degree* of *perfection* is not under *obligation* of that *precept* which requires no more then that we be *perfect*, as when the *precept* binds to no more then to be *mercifull* in ſome *degree*, it is evident that it binds not to be *mercifull* in the *higheſt degree*, and conſequently that the *higheſt degree* of *mercy* ſhall be ſtill *free*, under no *obligation* of *precept*.

33. In this matter he deſires to ſpeak his *own ſenſe in St Hieromes words, Charitas quæ non poteſt augeri* &c. citing *Ep.* 62 for it. But this *citation* is ſure *miſtaken*, there is no ſuch thing in that *Epiſtle*. The place ſure is in St *Hieromes Epiſtle* to St *Auguſtine*, where he deſires his ſenſe of thoſe words, *Jam.* 2. 10. *He that keeps the whole Law, and offends in one point, is guilty of all.* On which occaſion he diſcourſeth a great while, how *one virtue* may be found in them which yet are guilty of *other ſins*, and ſo from one thing to another, not by way of *defining*, but by *raiſing* of *difficulties* to provoke St *Auguſtines ſolution* of them. *Tom.* 9. *p.* 159.

34. And on theſe termes he purpoſes his notion of *virtue*, that it is the *loving of that which is to be loved*, and is in ſome *greater*, in ſome *leſs*, in ſome *none* at all, and then addes, *Pleniſſima verò, quæ jam non poſſit augeri, quamdiu homo hîc vivit, eſt in nemine; quamdiu autem augeri poteſt, profectò illud quod minus eſt quàm debet, ex vitio eſt. Ex quo vitio non eſt juſtus in terrâ qui faciat bonum, & non peccet, &c. But the moſt full virtue, ſuch as cannot be increaſed, is in no man as long as he lives here; But as long as it may be increaſed, that which is leſs then it ought to be, is faulty, whereby it is that the Scripture ſaith that there is not a juſt man on earth, which doth good and ſinneth not; and, in thy ſight ſhall no man living be juſtified; and, if we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelves &c.*

35. By this *view* of the place it is evident that the *virtue*, which, on occaſion of the place in St *James*, he ſpeaks of, being an *univerſall, impartial* obſervation of the *whole Law*, and conſequently every *failing* in that a *vice* (for to that all the *proofs* belong, that there is *no man but ſinneth ſometimes*) there is no reaſon to *extend* his *ſpeech* any farther then to this, and then it will in no wiſe be

appliable to *our* buſineſs, which is onely of the *degrees* of this or that particular *virtue*, which it is certain that man may have, who yet is guilty of ſome *ſin* in other *particulars*.

36. This therefore I willingly acknowledge, that he that *failes* of any part of his *duty*, is therein *faulty*, or this is *ex vitio* in him, and if of that onely S. *Hieromes* words [*quamdiu augeri poteſt*] be underſtood (as it is moſt reaſonable they ſhould, whether wee judge by the *occaſion*, or the *proofes* of his ſpeech, or by the *expreſs* words, *quod minus eſt quàm debet ex vitio eſt*, *that which is leſs then it ought*, i. e. *leſs* then he is *bound* to do, *is faulty*) then as I fully conſent to the truth of them, ſo when that is granted, no man can hence infer, therefore every *regular* act of *obedience* which comes ſhort of the *higheſt degree* of *perfection*, is a *ſin*; for beſide many other *inconveniences* formerly noted, this freſh one will be obſervable from St *Hieromes* own words, that then every act of *virtue* in this life is a *ſin*, for as for that *fulleſt perfection* which *cannot be increaſed*, the beginning of this *teſtimony* acknowlegeth, that it is *not* to be found *in any man in this life*.

37. In a word, the word *Perfection* is capable of *two notions*, either it may ſignifie the *perfect obedience* of *never ſinning*, and of this onely St *Hierome* ſpeaks, both when he ſaith it is *not attained* in *this life*, and when he addes, that *whatſoever is leſs then this is ſinfull*. Or elſe it may ſignifie any *higher degree* of exerciſe of any *particular virtue*, *chaſtity*, *mercy*, *fortitude*, &c. And of this onely it is that I ſpeak (and St *Hierome* in the words cited from him appears not ever to have thought of it) and to this onely my *affirmation* belongs, that there are *degrees* in that *perfection*, and that he that hath attained to any of thoſe *degrees*, *ſins* not againſt *Chriſts precept* of *perfection*, though he was not arrived to the *higheſt degree*.

38. But, ſaith he, *the Doctor goes on*, *If there be any perfection attainable in this life*, *twill be capable of degrees and growth alſo*] and then he addes, *whether he be of their mind who hold perfection poſſible in this life*, *I cannot ſay*, *but this I can ſay*, *he ſpeaks contradictions*, *for perfection admits of no degrees or growth*.

39. Here I ſee the *Reader* may be abuſed, if I do not give him a true *narration* of my words in that place, §. 46. Having mentioned

tioned one *interpretation* of the *perfection* which *Chriſt* commands us to aſpire to, *Mat.* 5. 48. viz. that it ſignifies *mercifulneſs*, *Lu.* 6. 36. I adde, *if that ſenſe will not be admitted, yet if it be any perfection acquirable in this life, twill be capable of degrees and growth alſo.* Now by a ſlight change of [if it be] into [*if there be*] this ſenſe is quite altered and made lyable to *ſuſpicion*, that I teach *perfection* (I ſuppoſe he muſt mean the *unſinning perfection* ſpoken of by St *Hierome*) *poſſible in this life*, and to the charge of ſpeaking evident *contradictions*, that I can talk of *growth* in ſuch *perfection*.

40. Truely there was little of *juſtice* in this, I hope he will be *ſenſible* of it. The *perfection* which I there ſpeak of, be it *love* and *mercy* to *enemies*, or be it any other *Chriſtian duty* ſet under *precept* by *Chriſt*, is certainly in ſome *degree attainable* in *this* life by them which have *ſinned*, and do ſtill *ſinne* through *infirmity*, in other things, and perhaps in ſome *circumſtances* of this, and then I hope there can be no *hereſie* in this, to ſay that by the *grace* of *Chriſt* one may *obey* ſuch a *precept* of *Chriſts*, *love* his *enemies* &c. when St *Paul* profeſſeth unlimitedly he *can do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengthened* him.

41. And then what *contradiction* can there be in affirming that in this *virtue* of *loving enemies*, of *mercy* &c. there are *degrees* and conſequently *poſſibility* of *growth*? Of *mercy* it hath oft been *exemplified* that it is ſo, and whatever particular *virtue* it be that can be phanſied to be meant by *Chriſt* by τελειότης *perfection*, I doubt not but it will be as viſible, when that *virtue* is named. But the *Diatribiſt* attempts nothing that way, onely miſtakes *perfection* for ſome other thing, either for a *ſinleſs perfection*, or for ſuch a *ſtate* as cannot be *increaſed*, knowing well enough that that is not *attainable* in *this* life, and certainly is not the matter of *Chriſt's precept*, *Mat.* 5. and as certainly is not the *perfection* that there I ſpeak of.

42. Once more, what I ſaid in this matter [that *if the perfection* (ſpoken of in the *objection*) *be not acquirable in this life, 'tis certainly not under Evangelical precept now*, citing that of *Mat.* 11. of *Chriſts light* and *ſupportable burthen*, and his *commands not grievous*, i. e. *poſſible to be performed by us*] falls under his very ſharp *diſcipline*, *This*, ſaith he, *is ſtrong and ſtrange confidence.*

His

43. His language I ſhall not onely willingly *bear* with, but *thank* him for it; I ſhall onely examine the *reaſons* which he offers for thus *accuſing* me. They are *three*, *First*, *becauſe the Law requires perfect obedience of Chriſtians, as the rule of eternal righteouſneſs*, adding that *all orthodox Divines have maintained this againſt the Church of* Rome, *Onely the Doctor is of the Church of* Romes *mind, and charges the Law with imperfection*, citing it from *Pract: Cat:* p. 94.

44. Here are many *miſadventures*, I ſhall but name them, 1. That the *Law requires perfect obedience of Chriſtians*, meaning by that the *Moſaical* Law, for that onely, he knowes, it is, which the *Doctor* chargeth with *imperfection*. The *Law* indeed ſometimes ſignifies the *Covenant* of *exact unſinning obedience*, and of that *Law* or that *Covenant* it is moſt true that it *required perfect*, as that ſignifies *unſinning obedience*. But then 1. This was the *firſt Covenant*, and is not *now* in force with *faithfull penitent Chriſtians*, who are *not under this Law but under grace*, i. e. under a 2d *Covenant* which requires not *innocence* but *repentance, ſincere*, not *perfect obedience*: And therefore 2dly. It cannot truely be ſaid that this *Law requires* this *perfect obedience* of *Chriſtians*, nor conſequently that it is the *rule* of *Evangelicall righteouſneſs*, i. e. of that *righteouſneſs* by which *believers* are now ſaid to be *juſtified*: I ſhall not inſiſt on the proving of this here, becauſe it is but a digreſſion in this place, and is abundantly explicated elſewhere, in the *Pract: Cat.* concerning the *two Covenants*.

45. 2dly. That he makes this doctrine of the *Law's* requiring *perfect obedience* of *Chriſtians*, to be one of the *Doctrines* maintained by the *orthodox* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, when it is indeed but a *contention* of *words*, that the *Diatribiſt* (it ſeems) and ſome others have eſpouſed againſt I know not what *adverſary*.

46. 3dly. That the *Doctors charging the Law with imperfection* is a thing wherein he *complies with the Church of Rome*, when tis evident in that place of the *Catech*: that 1. The words of *Chriſt* that he came, πληρῶσαι νόμον *to fill up* the *vacuities* of the *Moſaical Law*, and 2. The many expreſs *examples* of his doing ſo, in that 5t. of *Mat.* his *additions* to the *Law* in ſo many particulars

ticulars introduced with [*It was ſaid of old*—But I *ſay unto you*] and *laſtly*, the uniforme ſuffrage of all *antiquity* joyning in this *interpretation* of *Chriſts* words, was the ground whereon I built my *affirmation*, and if in this the *Church* of *Rome* were of my mind (as I do not find it is, making ſome of thoſe additions, *Mat.* 5. *counſels*, not *all* of them *precepts*) I ſhould never diſclaime the *doctrin* upon that account, any more then the *articles* of the *Creed*, which the *Church* of *Rome* is acknowledged to *believe* with us.

47. His 2d *proof* is, that *the Goſpel cals for the perfection of the law, Be ye perfect as he is perfect, Mat.* 5. *and be ye holy as he is holy*, 1 *Pet.* 1. 15, 16. I anſwer, 1. this proves not his *propoſition*, viz. that it was *ſtrong* and *ſtrange confidence* in me, to ſay, that *if the perfection be not acquirable in this life, 'tis not now under Evangelical precept*, *Acquirable perfection* may be (and ſome *degree* of it is) *under precept*, but *unacquirable perfection* is not. *Chriſts eaſie yoke* is not now made up to us of *impoſſible precepts*. 2dly. That *perfection* in one of the places mentioned by him, appears to be *mercifulneſs*, and the *holineſs* in the other, that of S. *Peter* being oppoſed ταῖς πρότερον ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ ὑμῶν ἐπιθυμίαις, *to the former luſts*, when they were in *ignorance*, reſpects either that ſort of *purity* particularly, or however that more *univerſal purity*, which is now more ſeverely *required* of all *Chriſtians*, in an *higher degree*, then it had been under the *Jewiſh œconomy*; and of either of theſe I never doubted, but they are now under *Evangelical precept*. But then ſtill that is nothing to the *higher degrees* of thoſe, or other *Chriſtian virtues*, which all this while we ſpeak of. No more is that which follows from the Doctor *himſelf*, *ſaying that Chriſt came to perfect the Law*. So he might do, and yet leave ſome degrees of *mercy* &c. *free* and not under *precept*, as hath oft been ſaid.

48. I ſhall not now take leaſure to examine, with what truth he addes, that that *perfection* which *Chriſt* came to adde is ſtill the *perfection* of *the Law*, It is true, it was the *requiring* of what the *law* had not *required*, and ſo the adding more to it, and *perfecting* it as a *law*, requiring all that ever ſhall be *required* of men by *law*, or *precept*. But this concludes nothing againſt *higher degrees* of this very *perfection*, being ſtill left *free*, and not *under law*, the onely thing which now he contends againſt.

49. His 3d *proof* is taken from the *account I give in the Pract. Cat.* p. 95. *of the lightneſſe and ſupportableneſs of Chriſts burthen*, 1. *in taking off the burthen of unprofitable ceremonies*, 2. *in taking away the damning power of every leaſt ſin*, &c. 3. *in giving greater ſtrength*. From whence he concludes, *It was not then, that he required not perfect holineſſe under the Goſpel*. I anſwer 1. μὴ γένοιτο, that this *concluſion* can with no *Logick* be thus deduced being *à teſtimonio negativè*. It is very poſſible there might be *other* reaſons, beſide thoſe I there named, My mention of *three* being ſufficient for the matter then in hand, did no way *prejudge* or *exclude* more. But then 2. I grant that this now mentioned, neither was, nor well could have been any part of my *account* of the *eaſineſs* and *ſupportableneſs* of *Chriſts Evangelical burthen*, above that *legal* of *Moſes*, becauſe it was common both to the *law* of *Moſes* and of *Chriſt*, that there were ſome *degrees* of *perfection*, which were by *neither* of them under *precept*, *Moſes's law* had place for *free-will offerings*, as well as *Chriſts*, nay *Chriſts* hath put ſome things under *precept*, as I conceive, which were not under *precept* by *Moſes's law*, in this one reſpect there lies more *weight* on a *Chriſtian* then did formerly on a *Jew*, but that is *abundantly* recompenſed by other *reſpects*, which this is not a ſeaſon to *inlarge* upon.

50. Having thus anſwered all his *objections* in this matter, it will I hope be *conſequent*, that he hath not yet *demonſtrated* the truth of that *aſſertion*, which from what he hath ſaid he aſſumes to be *apparently* and *viſibly true*, viz. that *every man is bound to do that which is beſt, becauſe the law and the Goſpel alſo require perfection of obedience in every commandment*; For to this I have oft replied, that both of them *require perfect obedience* to all, that either of them *requires*, which notwithſtanding there are ſtill מדרגות under both, which no *precept* either of *law* or *Goſpel requires*, or puts under *neceſſity* of *obligation* to any.

51. The *falſeneſs* of that *propoſition*, that *every man is bound to do that which is beſt*, I had formerly evidenced by *two* means, 1. the words of the *Apoſtle*, 1 Cor. 7. 38. *he that marries doth well, but he that marrieth not doth better*, 2. by this, that the *beſt* being a *ſuperlative*, *ſuppoſes the poſitive*, *which is lower then that*, *to be yet good*, &c.

To

52. To these he will now apply *answer*; To the *first*, that *well and better there, do not refer to moral goodness but worldly good, for the preventing of troubles in those afflicted and persecuting times.* But this *answer* will be soon shaken asunder, 1. by considering that as the *well* and *better* do certainly belong to the *same* kind of *good*, so it is visible that the *well* cannot belong to the *worldly* but *moral good*, and then consequently the *better* must do so too. That the καλῶς ποιεῖ, *doth well*, belongs to *moral goodness*, is evident by v. 28. where advising them that are loosed *from* mariage, *not to* mary, he addes ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γήμῃς οὐχ ἥμαρτες, *but and if, or, though thou do mary, thou sinnest not, and if the virgin mary, she sinneth not*, What can be more clear then that the *doing well* is *not sinning*, and sure that is a *moral*, not only a *worldly good*.

53. Nay 2. the *Apostle* is as expresse that the *marying* is quite contrary to the *worldly good*, for having said, that they that *mary sin not*, he addes immediately v. 28. θλῖψιν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ἕξουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι, *but such shall have trouble to the flesh*, and what can be more contrary to *worldly good*? But yet farther 3. the *Apostle* sets down the *advantages* of *not marrying* v. 32. *the unmarried careth for the things of the Lord how he may please the Lord and the unmaried woman in like manner that she may be holy both in body and spirit* v. 34. whereas the *maried man cares for the things of the world how he may please his wife*, and the *woman* in like manner *how she may please her husband*; And then are not these *spiritual* (not barely *worldly*) *advantages*, and is not the holyness of both *body* and *spirit*, and the caring for the things of the Lord, a greater *moral* or rather *spiritual good*, then the bare *caring* for the things of the *world*, to please a *yoke-fellow*? I hope I need say no more on this; not sure on that which he next addes, that *if the person have not the gift of continence, it is then not only good but necessary for him to mary*, for he knowes that as S. *Paul* spake of him that had that *gift*, when he saith he doth *better*, so I that only cited S. *Pauls* words, must be resolved to speak also. But as long as of him that hath that *gift*, i. e. hath *power* of his own *will*, it is true, that if he *mary*, he *doth well*, i. e. *sinneth not*, but yet *doth better* if he do *not mary*, it is evident that I have all that I pretend to, and certainly this is *given* me by S. *Pauls* words.

54. To my 2d *argument* that *the best being superlative, supposes*

the poſitive to be good, he *replies* [*I hope the Doctor will not deny but works done by Faith are good, and yet that they are not perfect in this life*, i. e. *come ſhort of what we are bound to by the Goſpel, will he now ſay they are evil?*] I *anſwer*, I will not ſay they are *evil*, but they are *good* though not *perfect* from all poſſible mixture of *ſin*. And what now he can *gain* from this his *queſtion* thus anſwered by me, as he expects I ſhould anſwer it, it will not be eaſie for any man to *imagine*, For ſure this is the *confirming* not the *diſproving* of my *argument*, For by his own ſetting it, it is *manifeſt*, that thoſe things are not *evil*, which yet are capable of a *greater perfection*, and then the *perfection* being the *ſuperlative* the *poſitive* is ſuppoſed to be *good*, and not *evil*, and yet *evil* it muſt have been, if every thing which is inferiour to the moſt *perfect*, were *ſin*, or if the *higheſt perfection* were under *Precept*.

55. What he addes out of *Gregory*, that *all humane juſtice is convinced to be injuſtice, if it be ſtrictly judged*] is 1. *contrary* to his former *queſtion* to me [*will he now ſay they are evil?*] whatſoever the *Doctor* think, the *Diatribiſt* it ſeems will ſay they are *convinced to be injuſtice*, and that, I muſt ſuppoſe, is *evil*, (and is not this great *inconſtancy* in him?) 2. It is of no force againſt my *pretenſions*, for when I ſaid, ſuch a thing is *good*, and another *beſt*, I never meant that either of them is not *convincible by Gods ſtrict judgement to have ſome mixture of evil*, but that tht *evil* which is or may be *adherent* to it in ſome other reſpect (as of all *humane* actions is acknowledged) being pardoned by *God* in *Chriſt*, the *lower degree* being *good*, i. e. an act of *obedience* to *Chriſts command*, that which is *higher* and ſo *better* then that, may yet be ſomewhat which he hath *not commanded*, and ſo ſtill a נדבה in a *Chriſtian*. And thus much on occaſion of the ſeveral *degrees*, and paſſages of my *anſwer* to the *firſt objection*, which I foreſaw, that which was taken from the *conſideration* of what *Prudence* might *adviſe* and ſeem to *require* of us, which hath proved a *buſineſs* of ſome length.

Sect. 9.

Sect. 9.

My anſwer to a ſecond ſort of objection, vindicated. Loving God with all the heart. Adam's *love in innocency capable of degrees. Perfect love that caſts out fear, to be had in this life. Chriſt more intenſe in prayer at one time then another, an argument that all is not ſinne that is leſs then the higheſt.*

1. TO the 2d *objection* from thoſe large *comprehenſive* words, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. I anſwer'd thus, that that phraſe [*with all* &c.] denoted onely two things, 1. The *ſincerity* of this *Love* of *God*, as oppoſed to *partial, divided love*, (to which I now adde for farther explication, that what we do according to the *precepts* of *Gods Law*, we do out of *love* toward *God*, not *hypocritically*, or as by *conſtraint*; and 2. not admitting *any thing elſe* into *competition* with him, this *ſincere love* of *God*, mean while being capable of *degrees*, ſo *that it is very poſſible for two men to love God with all the heart, and yet one to love him more intenſely then another* (as was *exemplified* among the very *Angels*) nay for the *ſame* perſon, which ſo *loves* him, to *love* him, and expreſs that *love* more *intenſely* at one time then another, as appeared by the *example* of *Chriſt*, *Lu.* 22. 44.

2. Now to this he replies: that *theſe two are there required, but not onely theſe, but perfect love, ſuch as caſts out fear*, 1 *Joh.* 4. 18. *ſuch as was in Adam in innocency*; To which I need ſay no more then what hath formerly been ſaid, that even that *perfect love* which was in *Adam* in *innocence*, conſiſted not in any *indiviſible* point, but had a *latitude*, and conſequently ſeverall *degrees* of that *perfect love*. But then withall it muſt be remembred that the *perfect love*, 1 *Joh.* 4. 18. is not all one with that which *Adam* had in *innocence*, for that he confeſſeth is not *acquirable* in this *life*, whereas the *love* in St *John* that *caſts out fear* is in every *Confeſſor*, and *Martyr* for *Chriſt*, and is elſewhere ſtyled, ἀγάπη ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, *love of Chriſt in ſincerity*, *Eph.* 6. 24. in the notion wherein *perfection* is all one with *ſincerity*; But then this

also is capable of *degrees*, one *Martyr* or *Confessor* may be more *zelous*, & expres more *intense* and *fervent love*, then another doth.

3. What he addes, and confirmes out of *Hierome*, was in one part answered before, and must not now be repeated; As for the other, it may *answer* it self, one part being directly *contrary*, if not *contradictory* to the other; For when he hath *admitted* and *allowed* of the *supposition*, that *sincere love is capable of degrees either in one man at severall times, or in two men at the same time, and so both obey the precept, yet*, saith he, *those degrees argue love not to be perfect, and so far faulty in vitio*,] But sure if those of whom the *supposition* is made, do *both obey* the *precept*, then they do not *offend* against it; if they do not *offend* against it, then is not this *faulty*, or in *vitio*, for sure every *fault* or *vice* must be a *transgression* of the *Law*. The evidence of the matter may, it seems, extort some few words of *truth* from a *gainsayer*, though to acknowledge it *intirely* and *constantly*, it must not be expected.

4. In the next place he passeth to the inforcement of my *argument* from what we read concerning *Christ* himself, that he was *more intense in prayer at one time then another*, when yet the *lower degree* was sure no *sin*; and prepares to make *answer* to it, viz. that *Christ was above the Law, and did more then the Law required, but men fall short many degrees of what is required.*

5. But sure this *answer* is nothing to the matter now in *hand*, for the evidencing of which that *example* of *Christ* was brought by me, viz. that *sincere love* is capable of *degrees*, This was first shewed in *several* men, and in the *same* man at *several* times, in the *several* ranks of *Angels*, and at last in *Christ himself*, more *ardent* in *one* act of *prayer* then in *another*; wherein what is affirmed of *Christ* is common to *Angels* and *men*, and so still may be though he *differ* from them in other things, to wit, that he is *perfect* and never *sins*, though men be *imperfect* and *faulty*, the *best* of them, For still it must be remembred, that it is not the *sinless perfection* we speak of when we say it consists in a *latitude*, and hath *degrees*, but *sincerity* of this or that *virtue*, expres in this or that *performance*, and as this, though it excludes not all *mixture* of *sin* in the *suppositum* (the man in whom it is) yet may by the *grace* of *God* in *Christ* exclude it in this or that *act* (for it is

certain

certain that I may in an *act* of *mercy*, give as much as any *Law obligeth* me to give, and ſo not *ſin* in giving *too little*) ſo to this, his *anſwer* belongs not at all, nor ſhews any *difference* or *reaſon* why ſuch *ſincerity* may not in any *pious Chriſtian*, be capable of *degrees*, as well as in *Chriſt* himſelf, and the *loweſt* of them be *ſinleſs*, and all the *Superior*, *voluntary oblations*, more then the *ſtrict Law required* of us.

6. Suppoſe a man ſhould in one *ejaculation*, pray to *God ſincerely* and *ardently*, to *avert* an *evill* from him, I ſhall ask, whether he commit any *ſin* in reſpect of *ardency?* If it be anſwered, yes, he doth, in caſe it be *poſſible* for him, or any man elſe, or *Adam* in *Paradiſe*, to pray more *ardently*, I ſhall then hope I ſhall have refuted his *anſwer*, by the *example* of *Chriſt*, who when he *prayed ardently*, did not *ſin*, though he *fell ſhort* of that *higher degree*, which after that we find he *uſed*.

7. As for that which *alone he addes* in this matter, that the *example* of *Chriſt holds forth, that great preſſures call for inlargements of affections, not as voluntary oblations, but as duties*. I ſhall onely ask whether they did ſo call for that very *degree* of *inlargement*, which *Chriſt* at *laſt* uſed, If it did not, then it ſeems this *addition* was little to the *purpoſe*, If he ſhall ſay it did, then how could he even now ſay, that *Chriſt* did *ſupererogate* in this *particular*, and that it was not *appliable* to *men*.

Sect. 10.

My anſwer to the laſt objection, of Supererogation. A place in St Cyprian vindicated from the Romaniſts reading. Imputare. An act of mercy in God that our works are rewarded. Supererogation wherein it conſiſts. The Diatribiſt's etymology of the word diſproved. Erogare. Erogatio. The Diatribiſts ways of Supererogating. Pride, Glorying. More reward for eminent uncommanded excellencies ſuperadded to duty. The Diatribiſts charity, and confeſſion of us. His cenſure of the Biſhops unjuſt.

1. Now follows my *anſwer* to the laſt *objection* freeing this doctrin of *voluntary oblations*, or of doing ſomewhat which is *free* and

and *uncommanded*, from all *lyableneſs* to the *ſuſpicion* of being *favourable* to the doctrine of *Supererogation* among the *Romaniſts*, which is founded in their *opinion* that a man may by theſe *performances* make *ſatisfaction* for his *own* and *other* mens *ſins*, which I that no way believe or acknowledge, cannot be charged as guilty of that *opinion*.

2. And to what is there ſaid, I muſt ſuppoſe with ſome *evidence*, §. 51, 52, 53. I ſhall here adde, and apply one conſiderable ſaying of St *Cyprian's* in the *Epiſtle* ad *Lapſos*, telling them that *Qui in Eccleſiâ ſemper glorioſi & granditer operati ſunt, opus ſuum Domino nunquam imputaverunt, Thoſe which have through all times wrought glorioufly and heroically in the Church, yet never thought their Maſter beholden to them*. That is the meaning of *imputare* to *reckon* their *layings* out & charge him with whom they *reckon* to be in their *debt*. For want of underſtanding of which (or from ſome *worſe* principle) the lattter *edition* of St *Cyprian* by *Pamelius* leaves out the word [*nunquam*, *never*] which the *old Baſil edition* doth retain, and the ſenſe evidently requires in that place.

3. By this (which is my *full* ſenſe in this matter) and by what is already ſaid in that *treatiſe*, that *objection* is wholly *ſuperſeded*, for I do not pretend that *God* becomes a *debtor* to any man for any of his moſt *bountifull ſpontaneous oblations*, but that 'tis an act of *infinite mercy* in *God*, as the *Pſalmiſt* ſaith, that any the moſt *excellent work* of ours is *rewardable* with him. And that *partly* becauſe we being *ſinners*, the utmoſt we can ever do, can never make *ſatisfaction* for our *ſinnes*, and partly becauſe whatſoever *degree* of *perfection* either by *doing* or *ſuffering* we can aſpire to, 1. It is ſtill a *work* of *God's* good *grace* and *ſtrength* in us, (for *what haſt thou which thou haſt not received?* and then what place for *glorying*?) and 2. It is in no *degree* meet or *worthy* to be *compared*, bears no *proportion* to the *glory which ſhall be revealed*, and partly again, becauſe *God* wants neither our *obedience*, nor our richeſt *performances*, we onely are like to receive the *benefit* of them, and ſo we onely are *debtors* to *our ſelves*, and can claime nothing from him, ſave onely on the *account* of *meer mercy*.

4. Now in his reply, the firſt thing that he *objects*, is that this *diſtinction* betwixt *doing more then is commanded*, *and doing ſomething which is not commanded, is new, and ſometimes coincident*

for

for he (ſaith he) *that doth ſomewhat not commanded, doth alſo ſomewhat more then is commanded.* And becauſe he cannot but know my notion there of *doing* ſomething *more*, *viz. doing all*, and and *more* then all, he therefore preſſeth it farther, that in this ſenſe the *Romaniſts in their ſupererogation doe not ſuppoſe that he which ſupererogates hath done all that is commanded him.*

5. To this I anſwer, by yielding that the *Romaniſt* is not ſo *groſſe*, as to affirm him that *ſupererogates* not to have *ſinned*, And therefore I never defined that to be the *Romaniſts* doctrine, or that our *doctrine* was by that one *diſtinction, differenced* from theirs, but having by way of *foundation* laid that *diſtinction* (as will appear to any that ſhall view the place §. 51.) I make the notion of *ſupererogation* to be founded in *one* of theſe *two*, either in having *paid all* that is *due* (i. e. having *never ſinned*) or 2. (having been a *debter*, i. e. *a ſinner*) in *paying* that *debt* by *ſatisfaction*. And the *latter* of theſe two it was, and not the *former*, wherein I placed the *Romaniſts opinion*, and wherein I conceived the *doctrine* of *free-will oblations* under the *Goſpel* to differ from their *doctrine* of *ſupererogating*, as appears §. 52. And this he ſees, and ſets down in his next words, It was but the *multiplying* of my *lines*, and his *own*, that he could not *earlier* take notice of it.

6. To this 2d then at length after ſome *proœme* he will proceed; that *ſtill I cannot free my doctrine from ſome kinde of ſupererogation, for*, ſaith he, *ſuch works have not their denomination from ſatisfaction made by them, but they are therefore called ſatisfactions, becauſe they are ſomething more then the law required, ſupererogare is as much as ſuper quod erogavit lex.*

7. By this at length appears what *bottome* all this *Diatribiſts* ſtructure is built on, the extraordinary *etymology* which his *fancy*, or ſome what elſe hath *ſuggeſted* to him, of the word *ſupererogation*, which if it ſhould hold, I (after all this debate thus farre prolonged) am obliged to *yield* the *cauſe* to the *Diatribiſt*, thus farre at leaſt, that I were a friend to one *word* made uſe of by the *Romaniſts*. But I am ſo well aſſured of this *Diatribiſts* failings in this kind, by the experience of his *ſuper ſtatutum*, from whence he would have *ſuperſtition* deduced (and loſt his chief hold, when that *origination* of the word was wreſted from him) that I may be allowed again to *queſtion* his skill in that *faculty*. That *ero-*

gare ſignifies to *lay out* (and not to *require*) is evident enough, *erogare pecuniam in claſſem, to lay out money upon the navy*, is *Cicero*'s phraſe, *pro* Flacco, *erogare pecunias ex ærario*, in his *Oration in Vatinium*, *erogare in oleum*, in *Plinie Ep.* 240. joyned with *conferre in operibus balnei, unde in eos ſumptus pecunia erogaretur*, in *Livie* l. 1. and the *ſubſtantive erogatio* for *expending* or *laying out*, *erogatio pecuniæ* in *Cicero ad Atticum* l. 15. 32. *Tot impendiis, tot erogationibus*, ſaith *Plinie* in his *Panegyrick*, and in *Suetonius* 'tis explained by *largitio*, and *profuſio pecuniarum*.

8. And accordingly *ſupererogo* is to *lay out all* and *more*, and from the *opinion* of *pious* mens doing ſo, the *Romaniſts* have clearly raiſed their *treaſure* of the *Church*, as the *bank* into which theſe *payments* are made. I could not have expected that there ſhould be any *queſtion* made of this; As it is, I hope this will ſatisfie it, And then alas what a *remote, unhappy etymologie* hath this *Diatribiſt* fallen on, *ſupererogare* is as much as *ſuper quod erogavit lex*! Had he been pleaſed to have *engliſhed* this *latine*, the miſtake had been too viſible, and therefore that was *more prudently omitted*; For what can *erogavit* ſignifie in that *period* of his? *Required?* (ſo he renders it in the following *period*, *works*, ſaith he, *may be ſaid ſupererogare, when men think they have done more then the law required*) But 1. that is in no wiſe the meaning of the word, as hath already been manifeſted; 2. whatſoever it ſhall be reſolved to ſignifie, yet in this way of *etymologie*, the *erogavit* belongs to the *law*, whereas we know in the uſe of the word among all *Romiſh* writers it is the man or the works (not the *law*) which *erogates*, i. e. *lays out* his *money, pains, life*, &c. and proportionably which *ſupererogates*. 3. (and which is yet more groſſe) the *ſuper* muſt in this *etymologie* be aſſigned to the *man*, as the *erogating* to the *law*, and ſo the one word be *divided* betwixt them, the *law* muſt be ſaid to *erogate*, the *man* to *ſuper*, and what is that, either nothing, or elſe to *ſupererogate*, and yet that he cannot do in any ſenſe wherein the *law* could be ſaid to *erogate*. Thus (beyond all either *reaſon* or *grammar*) *incongruous*, and *inconſiſtent* is this *etymologie*.

9. And this being ſaid concerning the *nature* of the word, all that remains of his *exercitation*, being built upon this *miſtake*, is

is perfectly *ſuperſeded*, yet I ſhall attend him κτλ. πόδα.

11. *In many reſpects*, ſaith he, *ſuch works may be ſaid to ſupererogate*, 1. *with reſpect to the law it ſelf, when men think they have done more then the law required, which makes them not ſupererogatory, but derogatory from the perfection of the law of God, and lays imperfection upon it* (*as the Doctor hath plainly done above*) To this I anſwer, 1. that by his own *confeſſion* theſe which he now mentions, are not *ſupererogatory* works, but the *contrary*, why then doth he ſet them as a firſt inſtance of the many *reſpects* in which ſuch *works* may be ſaid to *ſupererogate*? 2. When he knowes, that that *treatiſe* of mine, on which he *exerciſes* his *diſcipline*, doth not defend the thinking a mans ſelf to doe *more then the law requires*, but preciſely (in *diſtinction* from that) to *doe ſomewhat which the law doth not require*, why ſhould he ſtill *confound* things thus *ſevered*, and lay that to my charge which he knows I am not *guilty* of? 3. There is no truth in his *ſuggeſtion*, that this *doctrine* as it is taught by me, is *derogatory* to, or layes *imperfection to the law of God.*

12. For if by the *law* of *God*, he mean the *Moſaical law*, then though from *Chriſts* own words I conclude that he came to *fill* it *up*, or *perfect* it, and ſo that it had in it before *vacuities* and *imperfections*, yet the *doctrine* of the *treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip*, is no way founded or concerned in that; As for the *law* of *Chriſt*, under which, as well as under the *law* of the *Jewes*, ſome things are left *free* and *uncommanded* (and conſequently I affirm it poſſible for a *Chriſtian* to do ſomething which is *not commanded* him) I never accuſed that of *imperfection*, but doe without all *doubting* ſuppoſe it to be a *perfect codex* of *commands*, to which *God* will never adde more; and when I have done ſo, I found this doctrine of the *Chriſtians voluntary oblations*, in this *perfection* (not *imperfection*) of this *law*, viz. that even in the *greateſt perfection* there is a *latitude*, and the *higher degrees* of that *latitude* are not under *precept.*

13. A 2d way of *ſupererogating* he mentions in *reſpect to other men, as the Phariſee that ſaid with ſcorn and pride enough, I am not like other men, I faſt twice a week*, &c. To this I *anſwer*, 1. that this as little belongs to the *true*, as it doth to his *falſe* notion of *ſupererogating*. For in neither of them doth the *ſupe*r

include or *intimate superiority above other men*, and 2. that he that thus *scorns* and *exalts* himself above *other* men, is far from doing *more* herein then is *commanded*, tis evident he comes short of very *duty* in an *eminent* most *rewardable virtue*, that of *humility*, wherein he that strives not to *exceed* as much, and more, as in any *voluntary oblations*, tis evident that he is no *good Christian*, and I never undertook to plead for such *Pharisees*, but of all others think *Christians* obliged to use all *diligence* to avert this *shipwrack*.

13. And yet 3. the *Apostle* himself both by his *doctrine* and *practise*, allowes of καύχησις, that signifies literally a *glorying*, but it is certainly an *humble rejoycing*, in having done things which he knowes are *eminently acceptable* to *God*, and elsewhere, *rejoycing in his own work*, and as this is no way *increasable* to *a Christian* by comparing it with *other* mens *defects* or πτώματα, for his *charity* makes him *passionately* wish, and his *humility* really think all others *better* then *himself*, so it is very far from that *scorn* and *pride* in all *Pharisees* which makes them *discriminate* themselves from other men.

14. The 3ᵈ way he mentions is, *with respect to the overpleasing and acceptance of God, when they that think they can do something not commanded, expect to find more acceptance from God then they themselves or other do for doing onely what is commanded.* To this I answer, 1. That still this is nothing to the notion of the word *supererogating*, (which sure signifies not *overpleasing*) 2. That if one *caution* be taken in, viz. that *uncommanded works* can never *satisfie* for *disobediences*, and consequently that it is perfect *impiety* and *folly* to neglect any *duty*, on one side, and then to think to *compensate* that by doing more then is *commanded*, on the other side: If I say, this *caution* be premised, and proportionably the *earlyest* and *principallest* care be taken to secure *duty*, to make good *obedience*, in cannot be amiss in the *next* place to superadde this other care of the most *eminent heroical* (*uncommanded*) performances, and he that shall have observed this *method* uprightly, *eschewed evill*, in a strict *mortifying* of *lusts* &c. in *abstaining* from *sin*, and doing all that is commanded (as,

Virtus est vitium fugere, & Sapientia prima
Stultitiâ carnisse———)

And

And whenſoever he hath *failed*, ſecured his *retrait* by an early *humiliation, confeſſion*, begging of *pardon* in *Chriſt*, and *ſincere reformation*, and then *laboured* induſtriouſly to *ſuperſtruct doing* of *good*, works of the more *eminent* (I mean *uncommanded*) *degrees* of *virtue*, I ſhall not doubt to incourage him, to think *confidently*, and *expect* from our great βεβαιότὴς and ἀγωνοθέτης *more* and *greater acceptance* (I ſhall adde, *reward* alſo) then the *ſame* perſon could in reaſon expect for doing onely what is *commanded*.

15. And though it be not beſt for him in this caſe to *compare* himſelf with *other* men, the poſſible *hazard* of that, *exemplified* by the *Phariſee*, perſwading the *contrary*, yet of the truth of the *ſucceſs* there is no reaſon to make *queſtion*, or *ſuſpect*, but that of *two* men which have been *equall* in *obediences*, one *exceeding* the other in *acts* of *uncommanded perfection*, the more *perfect* ſhall have the *richeſt reward*, as is moſt evident whether by conſidering the *degrees* of *glory* in *heaven*, or the *rule* by which *God diſtributes* them ſtill under the *Goſpell*, by way of *reward* to every man, *ſecundum opera, according to his work*.

16. What he addes of *Papiſts thinking they can merit with God by ſuch works for themſelves and others, though ours*, ſaith he, *are not come ſo far yet*] is an eſſay of his *charitable opinion* of us; and I ſhall take it by the beſt *handle* I can, and *conclude* from it, then, by his own confeſſion, we are not *Papiſts yet*, and then I do not (after all that *tract* of *Will-worſhip*) maintain *works* of *Supererogation yet*, and then I need onely adde, that tis no way uſefull for him to loſe his *pains* and his *charity* by *confuting* thoſe of whom he onely *divineth* that they *may hereafter* fall into *falſe doctrine*, which yet I hope I ſhall not do, having no *temptation* from all this *Diatribiſt's Exercitation*, and the *arguments* therein contained, to fly to any other *Sect* of *Religion* to furniſh my ſelf with *anſwers* for him.

17. What now remains in the ſhutting up this 2d. *Exercitation*, is wholly ſpent either in proving it to be my *doctrine* (which I willingly and expreſſely grant it to be) that the *voluntary oblations are more acceptable and rewardable with God*, or in repeating his own ſenſe, *the more voluntary the more abominable* (wherein it ſeems we are already at diſtance enough, a man need not fly to the

Papists doctrine of *Supererogation* to make the *breach* the *wider*) or in *charging* on this *doctrine* that it makes *Superstitious Will-worshippers and formalists to overlook others with abundance of contempt and insolence*, adding *Characters*, by which we may discern who they are to whom he is pleased to *affixe* these titles.

18. To which my *answer* is 1. with St *Paul*, *Rom.* 14. that as those which *freely* do those things which others account *unlawfull*, ought not to *despise* those which *do* them *not*; so on the other side, those which *do* them *not*, ought in no wise to *judge* or *condemne* those which *do* them, and consequently that if our *Bishops*, whom he seems to *translate*, those who did *overlook* others, had really been *guilty* of *contempt* and *insolence* toward them, yet had not this been more *criminous* in them, more contrary to St *Paul's* direction, then this which is here *visible* in this *Diatribist*, in calling them *Superstitious Will-worshippers*, and *Formalists*, which first presumes all use of *uncommanded ceremonies* to be *Superstition* first, and then *Formality:* and so is a *double untruth*, and 2. charges those two great *sins* upon his own *Lawful Superiors*, and so is a double *uncharitablenesse*, attended with *disobedience* to and *separation* from them: I delight not now to compare these *sins*, and affirme, which is more *culpable*; If his own plain words or *conscience* do not accuse this *Diatribist* in any of these, neither shall I *accuse* him, but rather implore *God's pardon* for him; And onely adde 2. That I have reason to *hope* and *believe* that the *Governors* of our *Church*, and those who lately *presided* in it, did not make their own *voluntary performances* the *foundation* or *occasion* of any degree of *contempt* or *insolence* towards others which used them not; If any did, I neither *intended* nor now *design* any *defence* for them: And so much for the 2^d *Exercitation.*

CHAP.

Chap. VII.

Of Chriſtmaſs and other Feſtivals.

Sect. 1.

The obſervance which is due to the Cuſtome of a Church. The Teſtimonies of Ambroſe, *and* Auguſtine, *and* Iſidore.

IN our entrance on the diſcourſe of *Feſtivals*, I had thought that the *cuſtomary practice* of the *univerſal Church* of *Chriſt*, and particularly the *perpetual immemorial uſage* of the *Church* of *England*, continued, as farre as we can *diſcern*, from the *firſt plantation*, without any *interruption*, to the time of *writing* that *treatiſe*, might have had ſome weight with any that were not *contentious*, if it were but upon the account of S. *Pauls argument* thus drawn from the *cuſtomary practiſe* of the *Churches* of *God*. *Numb.* 1.

2. On occaſion hereof the *Diatribiſt* falls preſently into the *examination* of that place where S. *Paul* uſeth that argument 1 *Cor.* 11.16. and inquires what inferences naturally ariſe from the words of the *Apoſtle*. But I who deſigned to conclude no more from that *reference* but only this, that the *cuſtome* of the *Church* ought to be of ſome *force* and *weight* with any *meek ſon* of the *Church*, have no need of following him into that *inquiry*, if the looſeſt conſideration and very firſt *view* of thoſe words do not prove that, neither ſhall I farther *contend* for it.

3. *Paul* argued from *cuſtome*, and I propoſed the like *argument*, and ſo made a *reference* to S. *Paul*, whoſe *example* I thus farre *tranſcribed*, and if in other *reſpects* the *analogy* held not, it matters not, ſo it held in *this*, that *cuſtome* was conſiderable in *circumſtances* of *religion*, ſuch was *covering* or not *covering* the *head* in the ſervice of *God* there, and ſuch is the *obſervation* of a *Feſtival* here; And this is all that I need reply to his *firſt* §.

Yet

4. Yet I ſhall *ex abundanti* adde one or two *teſtimonies* for the confirming the *weakeſt* part of that conſideration, viz. the *reaſonableneſs* of complying with, (ſo as not to *oppoſe*) the *cuſtome* of any *particular Church*, though they be no more then ſo, though they pretend not to be derived from the *Apoſtles*, whether by *inſtitution* or *practiſe*, ſuppoſing withall that they are no way *contrary* thereto.

5. And 1. We have the words of St *Ambroſe*, ſufficiently known. *Ad quamcunque Eccleſiam veneritis, ejus morem ſervate, ſi pati ſcandalum non vultis aut facere; To whatſoever Church ye come, obſerve the cuſtome thereof, if you will neither receive nor give ſcandal.*

6. 2dly. The (as clear) words of * St *Auguſtine, Ego te illud breviter admonendum puto, traditiones Eccleſiaſticas (præſertim quæ fidei non officiunt) ita obſervandas ut à majoribus traditæ ſunt, nec aliorum conſuetudinem aliorum contrario more ſubverti. I would briefely admoniſh you that Eccleſiaſtical traditions (eſpecially ſuch as offend not the faith) are ſo to be obſerved as they are delivered by our Anceſtors, nor muſt the cuſtome of ſome be ſubverted by the contrary cuſtome of others.* And yet higher in the ſame *Epiſtle, Unaquæque provincia præcepta majorum leges Apoſtolicas arbitretur, Let every Province eſteem the precepts of their Anceſtors as Apoſtolical Laws*, i. e. certainly pay *obſervance* to them, though they be not of *Apoſtolical inſtitution.*

* Ep. 28. Tom: 2^dp. 69.

7. So *Iſidore*, l. 2. *de Eccl: Offic*: c. 43. *Nec diſciplina in his melior eſt gravi prudentique Chriſtiano, niſi ut eo modo agat quo agere viderit Eccleſiam ad quam deveneriit. There is no better rule in ſuch things for a grave and prudent Chriſtian, then to do in that manner as he ſees the Church do to which he comes.*

8. Store of *ſuffrages* might be heaped up on this *occaſion*; theſe few may ſuffice to *juſtifie* all that I had ſaid in that *firſt* §.

Sect. 2.

Sect. 2.

Heathen adherents a proof of the firſt Antiquity.

1. THE 2d 5. had propoſed one *argument* for the *antiquity* of this *uſage* among us, founded in the *adverſaries ſuggeſtion* againſt it. The *adverſaries* generally accuſe the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtivity* for ſome *heatheniſh mixtures* reteined in it; From which, if it were true, or however from the *conceſſion* of thoſe that affirmed it, I conceived an *argument* might be drawn, that therefore it was to be taken as *granted*, that this *uſage* was continued among us from the time of our *firſt converſion* from *heatheniſm*.

2. And I cannot yet ſee how this *inference* can be *avoided*; For how can any *heathen uſage* adhere to this *Feſtivity*, if all *heathen* cuſtomes were laid aſide long before this *Feſtival* were obſerved? Can it be imagined that after the *ejecting* of *heatheniſm* and the ſolemn *abolition* of all their *feaſts, Saturnalia* and the like, when *Chriſtianity* had gotten the *poſſeſſion*, there ſhould ſtill continue among them thoſe *adherent rites* of their *heathen feaſts*, ſo many *accidents* without their *ſubjects*? Or that *Chriſtians* that had long ſince renounced *heatheniſm*, and at length received this *Chriſtian feaſt*, ſhould ranſack their *heathen rituals* for *ceremonies* wherewith to *adorn* it?

3. But this, it ſeems, is of no force, or (as he ſaith) *no way conſtringent* with this *Diatribiſt*; *For*, ſaith he, *they might be added ſome good while after the firſt converſion of ſome part of this Iſland, the better to win the reſt to a liking of Chriſtian religion, by conforming to them in the celebration of feſtivals. As the like was done to win the Jews in obſerving the old ſabbath, Pentecoſt*, &c.

4. But ſure there is little force in this *evaſion*; For 1. it is by this *anſwer* confeſt, that as to *ſome parts* of this *Iſland*, my argument is of *force*, and that in thoſe this *feſtival* was introduced as *early* as their *Chriſtianity*, and if that may be granted me, I ſhall contend for no more by this *medium*, but think I have gained a very fair confeſſion for the *antiquity* of this *uſage* in this *Church*, that this *feſtivity* was thus *early* introduced among us, even as ſoon,

if not before *Chriſtianity* had gotten *poſſeſſion* of this *whole Nation*.

5. Meanwhile, that the *Nation* was not converted the ſeveral parts of it together (I mean not every perſon of every part, but ſome of all) or that there was any ſuch *interſtitium* or *interval* conſiderable betwixt the *converſion* of *ſome* part of this *Iſland* and the reſt of it, this is incumbent on the *Diatribiſt* to prove, or elſe the *argument* remains in full force to the whole *Nation*, as well as to any *part* of it. And for this he hath offered no proof, and ſo hath yielded the force of my *argument*, when he went about to *refute* it.

6. 2dly The example of the *Chriſtians* complying with the *Jews*, will ſtand him in as little ſtead; for when was it that the *Chriſtians* thus complied with the *Jews*, or that they retain'd their old *ſabbath*, out of that deſign of compliance with them? Was it not at the *time* of the *firſt converſion* of the *Jews* to *Chriſtianity*? Can it be imagined that the *Jews* were a *good while before converted* to the *faith* and to the *doctrine* of the *abolition* of the *ſabbath*, and then, ſome *good while after* that their *converſion*, the *obſervation* of their *ſabbath* ſhould be reduced, *expoſt liminio*?

7. Would not this be a *conſtringent* argument to any gainſayer to prove that *baptiſm* was introduced at the firſt *beginnings* of *Chriſtianity*, becauſe *baptiſme* is known to be a *cuſtome* taken from the *Jews*? And ſo ſure of the *ſabbath*, and the like; If any ſpace or *interval* had come in after the *planting* of *Chriſtianity* among the *Jews*, it is no way probable that the *ſabbath* once laid aſide, as a *ceremony nailed to the croſs of Chriſt*, would ever after have been *recalled*, and obſerved among *Chriſtians*; only at the *firſt converſion* or *plantation* of the *faith* ſuch things might from the *Jewiſh ſtate adhere* unto the *Chriſtian*, though they were not taught by *Chriſtianity*, and ſo ſome others from the *heathen* alſo, tis poſſible and imaginable; but tis no way ſuppoſeable *after* the ſpace of *many* years, when *heatheniſme* with all its *rites* and *adherents* had long ago been caſt out.

8. And let this ſerve for his 2^d §. The matter is not ſo weighty (being but an *argumentum ad homines*) as to deſerve any greater *length* of *diſcourſe* to *vindicate* it.

Sect.

Sect. 3.

Of Creſcens *coming into* France, *and* Simon Zelotes *into* England. *The difference of keeping* Eaſter *in the* Weſt *and* Eaſt. *Teſtimonies for our converſion in the Apoſtles times, Before King* Lucius. *The* Diatribiſts *ſuggeſtion diſproved.* Britain *not converted from* Rome.

1. CConcerning the *firſt planting* of *Chriſtianity* in this *Nation* by ſome *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon, what was ſaid with competent probability out of our *hiſtories*, is conſidered by the *Diatribiſt* in the next place, but nothing ſaid or offered to be proved by him, which may exact *anſwer* from me, the whole matter eſpecially being but a παρεργον to the buſineſs of *Feſtivals*: only ſome paſſages of his muſt be *ſhortly* noted.

2. As 1. when from my ſaying that *Creſcens his being in* France *removes all improbability from thoſe hiſtories that record the plantation of Chriſtianity in theſe Iſlands in the Apoſtles times*] he ſeems to believe it my opinion that *Creſcens came over hither*, (*for ſo*, ſaith he, *the Doctor would have it, and proves it out of Scripture*) which very thing he knowes I abſolutely diſclaim, and only conclude it as *credible* that ſome other *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon ſhould ſo early come over hither and plant the *Faith*, as that *Creſcens* ſhould come into *France* in S. *Pauls* dayes, which yet the *French* generally believe that he did, and have received it by *tradition*, and the words of *Scripture* may very fitly be ſo interpreted as to affirm it (and I do not believe that *Eſtius* hath, or that this *Diatribiſt* can demonſtrate the *contrary*, I am ſure he hath here produced nothing toward it, but the bare name of *Eſtius*.

3. That *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes* was the perſon that firſt *planted* the *faith* here, I receive from our *Stories* by *tradition*, and accordingly ſatisfie my ſelf therewith, and never attribute it to *Creſcens* or any other, but particularly expreſs my reaſons why I cannot imagine it to be *Creſcens*, and therefore am very much *miſreported* in this matter.

4. All that I had to do with *Creſcens* in that place was only this, that from the *authority* of the relations of *Creſcens*'s coming ſo early into *France*, I thought I might conclude againſt the *improbability* of *Joſephs* or *Simons* coming hither, the latter being perfectly as *credible* as the *former*, and the *paſſage* from *France* to *England* ſo *ſhort* and *eaſie*, that there can be no *difficulty* or *diſparity* in the matter, that one ſhould be believed by the *French*, and the other be *incredible* to us. This was ſet down intelligibly enough in that treatiſe, if the *Diatribiſts* haſte or ſomewhat elſe had not caſt the cloud over it.

5. Secondly, when from the *time* of celebrating *Eaſter anciently* in this *Nation* I conclude that neither *Peter* nor *Paul* nor *Creſcens* did *firſt* bring the *Faith* into this *Iſland*, and the *Diatribiſt* thinks he hath thereby gained an advantage, and that the ſame reaſon is of force againſt *Joſeph* and *Simon Zelotes* alſo, this is an evident *miſtake* in him. For it is ſufficiently known that as the *Weſtern* cuſtome of keeping *Eaſter* was deduced from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, ſo the contrary *Eaſtern* obſervation pretended to *tradition* from other *Apoſtles*, particularly from S. *John*. Now as to the former of theſe it is conſequent, that none of the *aſſociates* or attendants of S. *Paul* or S. *Peter* were the *planters* of the *Faith* here (and ſo not *Creſcens*, who was ſuch, 2 *Tim.*4.11.) becauſe of thoſe it is not imaginable that they ſhould *vary* from the cuſtome received from thoſe two *Apoſtles*, as tis apparent the *firſt Chriſtians* here did, in the *celebrating* of *Eaſter*; ſo it is no way concluſible of all others, which related not to thoſe *two Apoſtles*, and ſuch I ſuppoſe *Joſeph* and *Simon Zelotes* were, it being very poſſible that either of theſe might comply with the *Jewiſh* account, and accord with S. *John*, and the *Eaſtern* Church in this *celebration*.

6. And accordingly as by this *indication* it appears, that the words of *Metaphraſtes* concerning *Simon Peters preaching* the *faith*, and *conſtituting Churches* &c. in *Britain* in the 12th of *Nero*, cannot be deemed to have truth in them, ſo if it may be ſuppoſed that *Metaphraſtes*, receiving his *intelligence* from ſome more *ancient author* or *tradition*, miſtook *Simon Peter* for *Simon Zelotes*, I ſee not what could be objected againſt the *probability* of the relation, either in reſpect of the perſon of that *Simon*, who is by very

very good Authors deemed to have been the *planter* of the *faith* here, or in respect of the *earlinesse* of the *plantation*, in or before the 12th of *Nero*, i. e. within 34 years after *Christs ascension*.

7. To this matter of the *antiquity* of the *faith* in this *Island*, and that particularly by this *Simon Zelotes*, I shall now add some *few* considerations: First out of the [a] words of *Theodoret* in his *Therapeut: Ser: 9.* περὶ Νόμων, where having compared the *Apostles* of *Christ*, under the title of [b] ἡμέτεροι ἁλιεῖς καὶ τελῶναι *our fisher-men and Publicans*, with the *Lawgivers* of the *Grecians* and *Romanes*, he affirms that whereas these latter did not *perswade* or gain upon *their next neighbours to live according to their laws, those former wrought upon not only* Grecians *and* Romanes, *but* ἅπαντα τὰ βαρβάρων τὰ φύλα *all the nations of the Barbarians* (among which we know the *Britains* were vulgarly contained) *and brought them to embrace the Evangelical law*; and if this be yet too *general*, he then addes the enumeration of the *severals*, and among them by name specifies the *Britains*, οἱ δὲ ἡμέτεροι ἁλιεῖς, καὶ οἱ τελῶναι, καὶ ὁ σκυτοτόμος ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις τοὺς εὐαγγελικοὺς προσενηνόχασι νόμους, καὶ οὐ μόνον Ῥωμαίους καὶ ὑπὸ τούτοις τελοῦντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ Σκυθικὰ καὶ τὰ Σαυροματικὰ ἔθνη, καὶ Ἴνδους καὶ Αἰθίοπας, καὶ Πέρσας, καὶ Σῆρας, καὶ Ὑρκάνους καὶ Βακτριανοὺς καὶ Βρεττανοὺς, καὶ Κιμβροὺς, καὶ Γερμανοὺς, καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ γένος ἀνθρώπων δέξασθαι τοῦ σταυρωθέντος τοὺς νόμους ἀνέπεισαν. A clear testimony that the *Apostles* themselves in *person* paid this *obedience* to *Christs* command of *going to all nations*, none excepted, and that with some kinde of *successe* every where, particularly here in *Britain*.

[a] *See Sir H. Spelman De Exord. Christ. Rel. in Brit. p. 2.*

[b] *p. 123.*

p. 125.

8. 2dly From the express words of * *Nicephorus Callistus*, who setting down the *several* plantations of the *Apostles*, hath these words of *Simon Zelotes*, Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐπιπτᾶσαν αὐτῷ τὴν παναγίου πνεύματος ἐπιφοίτησιν, Αἰγύπτῳ, Κυρήνῃ τε καὶ τῇ Ἀφρικῇ προσβαλὼν Μαυριτανίαντε, καὶ ὅσοις τῆς Λιβύης ἐστὶ, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διαδραμὼν, καὶ πρὸς Ἑσπέριον Ὠκέανον εἰσβαλὼν καὶ τὰς Βρεταννικὰς νήσους εὐαγγελιζάμενος πολλοῖς τε σημείοις καὶ θαυμάτων ἐπιδείξησι, θεολογίᾳ τε καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ Χριστὸν ὡς χρεὼν ἀνυμνήσας, ἀπείροις δὲ τῶν θλιψέων ἐξεταθεὶς τέλος καὶ τοῦτο τὴν διὰ σταυροῦ θάνατον, ἀλήκτῳ τινὶ χαρᾷ εἰσδεξάμενος, πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ διδάσκαλον μετεχώρησεν. *After the coming of the holy Ghost upon him, he betook himself to Ægypt,*

* *Hist. Eccl: l. 2. c. 40.*

and Cyrene, *and* Africk, *and passing through* Mauritania *and* Lybia *in the preaching of the Gospel, and adventuring on the* Western *Ocean, and preaching the Gospel to the* Brittish *Islands, and depredicating Christ as was needful both by many signes and wonders, and by divinity and doctrine, and being tried with many afflictions, at last with endless joy embracing the death of the cross he departed to his Master.* Which last passage of his *death*, that it belonged to these *Islands* also, is affirmed by *Dorotheus*, who addes that he was *slain* and *buried* here, and thereto accord the *Greek Liturgies* in their *Menologie*, though *Baronius* and others dissent in that particular of his *death*.

9. Thirdly, That *Gildas Brito* or *Badonicus*, who affirms that *Christ* was preached to *Britanny* (under the name of *glaciali frigore rigenti Insulæ*) *summo* Tiberii Cæsaris, in the last *year of* Tiberius Cæsar, *i. e.* in the *fifth* year after *Christs resurrection*, is by Sir *Hen: Spelman* cited as *author gravis & eximiæ fidei, a grave author and of great fidelity*, anciently styled *Sapiens, The wise*, and so agreeing with these former *testimonies*, may deserve to be heeded by us, and not cast off, as by the *Diatribist* he is, magisterially dictating, that his *affirmation* was *meer tradition and far from probability*, but not adding the least proof of it, but only that *no authors of any credit lay it so high*, with what truth, doth now competently appear, and is yet farther confirmed by a former *testimony* brought by Mr. *Fox* out of *Gildas Albanicus* in his book of the *victory* of *Aurelius Ambrosius*, where he affirmes *Britannie* received the *Gospel* in the reign of the *Emperor Tiberius*. To this accordeth also the *Vatican MS.* out of which *Baronius* placeth the reception of the *Faith* in this *Island* about the year 35. which is *two* years earlier then the *last* of *Tiberius*.

p. 107.

10. For *other* passages to the same *purpose*, especially for the *relations* of *Joseph* of *Arimathea* in *Guil: Malmesbur:* I refer the Reader to that worthy *Antiquary*, Sir *Henry Spelman, de exord:* p. 4. &c. And whatever the *Diatribist* suggests, I see not indeed in any or all of this the least degree of either *impossibility* or *improbability*; For of those *Apostles* that immediatly after *Christs ascension* took their *journeys* to several *corners* of the *world*, to *publish* and *propagate* the *Gospel*, what difficulty is there in believing

ving, that in the ſpace of *four* or *five* years, ſome one either by himſelf, or by his *miſſive*, at leaſt that the *tidings* of that bleſſed *newes*, ſhould finde the way hither into this *Iſland*? I ſhall now adde no more of this.

11. Laſtly, when in the ſetting and tranſlating the *ſuppoſed* words of *Eleutherius* to *King Lucius*, the *Diatribiſt* chargeth me for leaving out or not tranſlating *nuper* (which the *Latine* in my *margent* retained) adding that I did it wiſely (I ſuppoſe on ſome *deſigne* to aſſiſt my cauſe) and *leaving others to judge why it was done*; this is but a *calumny* all this while.

12. For 1. having (as he acknowledges) ſet down the word *nuper* in the *margent*, that was a fair *evidence* to any charitable perſon that there was no *treachery* deſigned the *Reader*, for it being certainly *foreſeen* by me that my Readers would eaſily underſtand ſo much *Latine* as the rendring of *nuper* would amount to, I had been by any ſuch deſigne engaged to conceal the *Latine* alſo, the ſetting down that, was the certain way of *diſcovering* any ſuch ſuppoſeable treachery, and ſo ſure no *artifice* or *maſter piece* of *wiſdome* (which the *Diatribiſt* imputes to me) but at once an *act* and *puniſhment* of *folly* ſuch as I heartily deſire may alwaies attend ſuch *enterpriſes*.

13. But I need not ſuch *preluſorie* anſwers as theſe, the matter is plain to any man that hath *eyes* in his *head*; My *Engliſh* tranſlation was not *verbum verbo*, yet by way of *paraphraſe* perfectly *anſwerable* to the *Latine*, the *Latine* is, *Suſcepiſtis nuper miſeratione divinâ in regno Brittanniæ legem & fidem Chriſti*, and the *Engliſh* is as explicite to every *minute* part of it, that *before that writing of his* (is not that the full *paraphraſe* of *nuper*, without defining what is not there defined, how long, or how little while agoe this was, but only *before* the *writing* of *Elutherius's Epiſtle*) *the kingdome of* Britain *had received by Gods mercy the law and faith of Chriſt*. I ſee there is no hope of approving my ſelf to this *Diatribiſt*, If there were, I ſhould not have fallen thus cauſeleſly under his ſevereſt diſcipline, for ſuch I muſt eſteem this his *ſuggeſtion*, and the *inſinuations* accompanying it.

14. And yet after all this, if I had done the utmoſt which he can ſuppoſe, *viz.* not rendring *nuper* at all, on purpoſe that this *converſion* of the *Iſland* might be thought to be *long* before the time

of

of *Lucius* and *Eleutherius*, which was above 140 years after *Tiberius*'s deceaſe, I hope it is by this time plain by what hath here been ſaid of our *converſion* by ſome *Apoſtle*, particularly by *Simon Zelotes*, that I ſhould not much have abuſed the *Reader*. That the *faith* was not *firſt preacht* in *Lucius*'s days, but *revived* after the *death* of the *firſt planters* of it, I refer the Reader to learn from Sir *Henry Spelman* p. 12. out of our *ancient records*: And for the truth of the *paſſages* between *Eleutherius* and *Lucius*, as I never had *ingaged* my ſelf, ſo if from thence, as the *Diatribiſt* pretends, any inconveniences be now found conſequent toward the ſupport of the *Romaniſts* plea to our ſubjection, it will be his (not my) concernment to *fence* himſelf againſt them, having here thus farre acknowledged the *truth* of the *ſtory* that *Lucius* ſent to *Eleutherius* for ſome to *baptize* him and his people, withall from hence concluding that *Chriſtianity was not here planted from the Apoſtles times*.

15. And here let me adde in reference to his ſixth §. that if I ſhould yield what here he doth, that this *Nation* firſt received *baptiſm* not from any *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical planter*, but in *Lucius*'s days from *Eleutherius Biſhop* of *Rome*, it could not well be imagined how our *ancient Britiſh* ſhould be found ſo *different* from the *uſages* of *Rome* in the *celebration* of *Eaſter* &c. as it is known they were before, and at the time of *Auguſtines* coming hither. For certainly the *Weſtern* manner was conveighed to all who had their *Chriſtianity* or *baptiſme* from *Rome*.

16. And indeed, as to the other concernment, what would it avail us to prove that we had not our *Chriſtianity firſt* from *Rome* in *Auguſtines* time, if we be yielded to have had it *firſt* from *Rome* in *Eleutherius*'s time? I deſire the *Diatribiſt*, which even now foreſaw the *danger*, will now ſee to it.

17. What to this he ſaith (*viz.* that *the Eaſtern Chriſtians which kept their Eaſter after the Jewiſh manner, kept it not ſo in the Apoſtles times*) is neither proved to have any *truth* in it, nor if it had, would it give any account of the *reaſon* of the *Britiſh* retaining the *Jewiſh* and *Eaſtern* cuſtome, in caſe they had their *baptiſme* from *Eleutherius*, for as to the *latter* of theſe, though this *difference* were granted to be of a *later* original then the *Apoſtles* times, yet what poſſibility were there that the *Britiſh* ſhould have

the

the *Eaſtern Jewiſh* cuſtome from *Rome*, when the *Romiſh* was conſtantly the *contrary*, or that receiving *Baptiſme* from *Rome*, we ſhould have our moſt *ancient* rites from *Greece*, quite contrary to the *uſages* of *Rome*.

Sect. 4.

The keeping of Eaſter *in the Apoſtles times.* Polycrates's *Epiſtle to* Victor. *The* Aſiatick *way from* Philip *and* John. *From* Philip *derived to* Britanny. Ἑορταζομεν. Κυριακη. *The teſtimonie of* Socrates *againſt Feſtivals, examined.*

1. AS for the *truth* of his negation §. 6. that the *Eaſtern Chriſtians which kept their* Eaſter *after the* Jewiſh *manner, kept it not ſo in the Apoſtles times*] It will deſerve conſidering a while, and the rather becauſe this of *Eaſter* being certainly a *Chriſtian Feſtival*, the annual commemoration of the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, and that obſerved by the *Aſiaticks* on *any* day of the *week* on which the *quartadecima Lunæ* ſhould fall, and not only on the *Lords day*, if that ſhall be found to be ſo kept by any of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, this will be no ſmall prejudice to the *Diatribiſts* pretenſions, who will not, muſt not allow any other *feſtival* among *Chriſtians*, but that of the *weekly ſabbath* or *Lords day*, as tis by him deduced from the *fourth Commandment*. And accordingly in his reaſoning here againſt it, his *arguments* proceed not only againſt the *Jewiſh* manner, but againſt the *feaſt* it ſelf being obſerved in the *Apoſtles* times, as will preſently appear.

2. Now then for the clear *trial* of this *negation* of his, on which his cauſe ſo much dependeth, I appeal to the *hiſtory* of that *queſtion* or *controverſie* betwixt the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Church*, as it is ſet down with very little *difference* by *Euſebius* l. 5. and *Nicephorus* l. 4.

3. And firſt, tis *Euſebius* affirmation of it that *all the Provinces of* Aſia *obſerved it on the fourteenth day*, ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας l. 5. c. 23.

στίας. as from a more ancient tradition, and again as τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκράτησεν ἐπὶ πολὺ, a custome long before delivered to them; which, considering the time wherein this question was agitated at the end of the second Century, can amount to little less then Apostolical.

4. But I need not lay weight on this, his 24 Chapter gives us the full debate of it in the Epistle of Polycrates to Victor.

5. This Polycrates was the eighth Bishop of Ephesus, and was then 65 years old, which reacheth up very high, within 30 years of S. Johns time, and he [a] set down and manifested the tradition to be Apostolical, expressely deducing it from two of the Apostles, Philip one of the twelve, which, saith he, died at Hierapolis, and John the beloved disciple of Christ, who lived and died at Ephesus, adding to these Polycarp Bishop and Martyr of Smyrna, and Thraseas Bishop and Martyr of Eumenia, Sagaris of Laodicea, Papyrius, and Melito of Sardis, All which, saith he, observed, the fourteenth day τὸ πάσχα, according to the Gospel, μηδὲν παρεκβαινοντες, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες, keeping exactly the Canon of faith, and no way varying from it.

[a] Τῶν Ἀποστολικῶν παραδόσεων καὶ διαδοχῆς ἀρξάμενος ἐγὼ μικρὸς ἐν σαρκὶ κατοικῶ. Ἐπτὰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ γένει μου ἐπίσκοποι γεγόνασι· καὶ ἐγὼ ὄγδοος εἰμί. Niceph. l. 4. c. 37.

6. Here it is undeniably evident, that the Asiatick custome was by Polycrates (and all the Bishops of Asia συνεφάπτεσθαι τῇ ὑποθέσει consented to this Epistle of his) fetcht from two of the twelve Apostles, S. Philip and S. John. And if that which [b] our stories tell us of Philips being in France, and sending Joseph of Arimathea and others into Britain, be to be understood of Philip the Apostle, as [c] Gildas Albanicus expressely affirmes, then have we a clear account of the derivation of this custome of keeping Easter in this Nation from Philip to our first Christians, just as Polycrates in Asia deduces it from the same Philip.

[b] See Guil. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glaston. Eccl. ex Freculpho l. 2. c. 4. Et Baron: Tom. 1. an. 35. num. 5. Et MS. Hist. Angl: in Vatican. Biblioth.

7. And that affords us an irrefragable instance of the observation of Christian festivals among us, not only from the first plantation of Christianity among us, but even from the practice of the very Apostles themselves, which was the utmost that I could pretend to in this matter.

[c] Addit is missum fuisse Galilæi in Britanniam à Philippo Apostolo Josephum Arimathæum. Sir H. Spelman Apparat. p. 1.

8. And it is farther observable, that Pope Victor of Rome, though he was willing to have proceeded with greater rigor against the Asiaticks, even [d] ἀπολέμειν τὰς Ἀσίας πάσης ἅμα ταῖς ὁμόσε ἐκκλησίαις παρεμβάλλειν, to cut off or excommunicate all the Provinces

[d] Euseb. l. 5. c. 23.

and

and Churches of Aſia, ὡς ἑτεροδοξοῦσας, *as heterodox*, yet never queſtions the *truth* of *Polycrates's affirmations*, concerning his receiving the *cuſtome* from thoſe *Apoſtles*; And indeed the other *Biſhops* aſſembled, were not for ſuch ſeverity, but for *peace*, and *unity*, and *charity* with theſe *fellow Chriſtians*, and reprehended *Victor* ſeverely for his thoughts of *ſeverity*.

9. And the * *Epiſtle* of *Irenæus* to *Victor* is very conſiderable to this purpoſe, who though he reſolved on *Victors* concluſion for the keeping it on the *Lords day* only, yet he is abſolutely againſt *excommunicating* the *Aſiaticks* upon this very ground, that theſe *Churches* of *God* did ἀρχαίαν ἔθους παράδοσιν παρειληφῶν, *obſerve the tradition of ancient* or *original cuſtome*, and he farther tells him that the *Biſhops before him had never broken peace with any on occaſion of this difference*, inſtancing in *Polycarp* who came to *Rome* in *Anicetus's* time, and as *Anicetus* could not perſwade him to leave his *cuſtome*, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἀποστόλων εἰς συμβεβιωκότα, as *having obſerved it always according to* the practice of *John the diſciple of the Lord, and the reſt of the Apoſtles with whom he had converſed*, So neither could *Polycarp perſwade Anicetus* to leave his way, and yet they *communicated* one with another; Here again by *Irenæus* his own *confeſſion*, who was for the *Weſtern* cuſtome, the *Eaſtern* was practiſed by *John* and the *reſt* of the *Apoſtles* (ſure more then one) with whom *Polycarp* had *converſed*. * Κεφ. ις.

10. *Laſtly*, There is no doubt all this while of that which the *Weſtern* pretended for their *cuſtome*, that they had it ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως *by Apoſtolical tradition*, ſaith *Euſebius*, ἀποστολικαῖς παραδόσεσιν ἀνωθεν ἐπόμενοι *following the Apoſtolical tradition upward*, or *from the beginning*, ſaith *Nicephorus*, and that expreſſely from S. *Peter* the *Apoſtle*, which ſtill leaves the matter moſt evident and irrefragable, that this *feaſt* of *Eaſter*, which ſure is a *Chriſtian feſtival* (and all *others* are to be rated by that *ſtandard*) was *obſerved* and celebrated by the *Apoſtles*, and ſo is the evincing of all that I need to pretend to, for the *vindicating* of that *Reſolution* of the *Quære* concerning the *Feſtivals* of the *Church*. l. 5. c. xxv. l. 4. c. 36.

11. What now can be invented by way of *reply* to this *argument* thus inforced, I profeſs not to be able to foreſee; what he hath

thought fit to offer for the *proof* of the *contrary*, I shall now very briefly *consider*.

12. And 1. saith he, *there is no mention of the institution or observation of it in Scripture, nor any ground to found it on*, But to this, 1. It is sufficient to answer, that there is small *virtue* in this *argument* from *Scripture negative*. 2dly That the *Apostles* word ἑορτάζωμεν *let us keep the feast*, which by *circumstances* is applied to the *feast* of *Easter*, is some (be it acknowledged a lesse *weighty*) *ground* in *Scripture* for the *observation*. 3dly That the mention of Κυριακὴ *the Lords day*, *Rev.* 1. is some farther *ground* whether that signifie the *weekly* or *annual Lords day*; If it be the *annual*, there is then a clear evidence for the observation of it in the *Apostles* days; and if it should be the *weekly*, yet in any reason the *annual day* of the *resurrection* was the *foundation* of this *weekly day*, which we know is to commemorate the *resurrection*, as it is evident that the *weekly friday fasts* in the *Church* had their *foundation* in the *annual* great *fast* on the day of *Christs death* in the *Paschal week*.

13. 4thly If the *Scripture* should give us no kinde of mention of this, yet seeing it hath otherwise *appeared* from the most *ancient* and *undoubted records* of the *Church*, that *Easter* was observed by the *Apostles*, by *Peter* and *Paul* in one manner, by *John* and *Philip* in another, what place of doubt or question can there be in this matter?

14. What he addes in the *close* of his *first reason* that the *Apostles were so farre from instituting these as Christian feasts, that they do expressely repeal them and cry them down*, hath not the least *degree* of *truth in it*, as hath formerly appeared in the view of *Gal.* 4. 10.

15. His 2d proof is from *Socrates* the *Historian* saying that the *Apostles were not solicitous to appoint any festival days at all, therefore not this of* Easter. To this I answer, that *Socrates*'s words do not at all deny this to have been the *practice* of the *Apostles*, only his conceit is, that neither *Christ* nor his *Apostles* *l. 5. c. κβ. *νόμῳ τοῦτο παραφυλάττειν παρήγγειλαν *commanded to observe this by any law*, and again that they intended not περὶ ἡμερῶν ἑορταστικῶν νομοθετεῖν *to make laws of festival days*, referring the *original* of them to *custome*, which varied in several *regions*, as appeared to him

him by that difference betwixt the *Aſiatick* and *Weſtern Chriſtians*, from whence his *concluſion*, or (as in the ſame matter he ſaith, πειμαίρομαι) his conjecture was, that ἡ τῶν πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρ' ἐκείνοις ἐκ συνηθείας τινὸς ἐδιάζουσαν ἔσχε τὴν παρατήρησιν, διὰ τὸ μηδένα Ἀποστόλων μηδενὶ νενομοθετηκέναι περὶ αὐτῆς, *the feaſt of* Eaſter *among all ſorts of people had a peculiar different obſervation from ſome cuſtome, becauſe none of the Apoſtles had made any law concerning it.*

16. The ſhort is, *Socrates* ſaw that ſeveral *Nations* had their *ſeveral cuſtomes* of keeping *Eaſter*, ſome, ſaith he, from *Iohn*, others from *Peter* and *Paul*, ſetting down the very *ſtory*, as we have given it, out of *Euſebius*, and from thence he *collects* (how truly it matters not) that no *Apoſtle* had given any *binding law* to all *Chriſtians* concerning it.

17. And ſo I that ſpeak only of the *practice Apoſtolical*, and not at all of their νομοθεσία *commanding* it by *law*, am no way *incommodated* by this *teſtimony*. And for any more then ſo (*practice* and *cuſtome Apoſtolical*) it will be hard for the *Diatribiſt* to produce any evidence for the *weekly Chriſtian ſabbath* or *Lords day*; ſure the *New Teſtament* hath no where any νομοθεσία *giving* of *law* concerning it.

18. His 3d proof taken from the *difference of the obſervation of it in the* Eaſtern *and* Weſtern *Church, which*, ſaith he, *makes it evident that it was not inſtituted by the Apoſtles* I hath ſure now been competently anſwered, for though that difference conclude againſt the νομοθεσία or appointment of the day by *univerſal law*, yet it no way prejudgeth the *practice Apoſtolical*, or the derivation of the ſeveral *cuſtomes* from this *original*.

19. How *true*, or *pertinent* to his purpoſe that is which followes, that *the obſervation of* Eaſter *hath better antiquity then this of* Chriſtmas, *though not Apoſtolical*, doth already ſufficiently appear, the *Apoſtles practice* for the one being ſo *evident* on all hands, by the *confeſſion* both of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Chriſtians*, (the ſeveral *practices* being derived from ſeveral *Apoſtles*) that there can be no *doubt* in that matter; And then the *analogy* holding, and the *argument* proceeding in full force from one *Chriſtian feſtival commemorative* of *Chriſts reſurrection*, to another *commemorative* of his *birth*, or his *aſcenſion*, will certainly juſtifie

the *lawfulnesse* of the observation, though the *antiquity* should not *equally* be pleadable for it.

20. And so I hope I have fully *cleared* and *vindicated* the *concludency* of this *argument*.

Sect. 5.

Midwinter-day. The Winter Solstice. Julius's *Calendar.*

1. NExt he proceeds to view the *argument* drawn from the title which our *ancient records* give *Christmasse day*, calling it Midpintra-dæg *Midwinter-day* (and as I now finde in other *Saxon monuments* Midpintræs-mæsse *Midwinter-mass* or *feast*) and with this he is pleased to *refresh* himself and to be *cheerful* [*How sweetly all agree*, &c.] and then to make offer of some *answer*; But the truth is, he hath not made any the least *discovery* by those *answers*, that he *adverted* at all to that one thing, wherein *alone* all the force of the *argument* was placed; I shall therefore repeat it again for him.

2. The *Winter solstice* falling now many days *earlier* then the 25th of *December*, the acknowledged day of *Christs* birth, we are in reason to believe, that at the time when that title of *Midwinter-masse* was bestowed on this *festival*, the *Sun* entred into *Capricorn* (i. e. the *winter solstice* fell) if not *upon*, yet very *neer* to the 25th of *December*. And then this will drive it very high, up to the *Apostles* and our *Saviours* time, at the year of whose birth though as the *learned* exactly calculate it, the *Sun* entred *Capricorn* on the 24th of *December* at *Rome*, yet tis certain that *Iulius Cæsar* ordering the *Calendar* 43 years before that, and believing that in his time it was as *Hipparchus* had said (*viz.* that the *solstices* had *anticipated* 8. days, for so in his time *Hipparchus* had observed) he placed the *solstices* on the *eighth* of the *Calends*, i. e. on the 24th of *Iune*, and 25th of *December*: In consonance whereto, the *difference* being yet not great, the first *Christians*

Chriſtians might well call this *feaſt Mid-winter maſſe*, being indeed ſo neer the *ſolſtice* then, though the farther we deſcend from thoſe *firſt* times, the leſs *exactneſs* of truth we ſhall ſtill finde in that *appellation*.

3. Now to this Mr. *C.* is not pleaſed to make the leaſt word of *reply*, and ſo hath not qualified himſelf to expect any ſyllable of *return* from me to his 7th §. Only I ſhall tell him for his utmoſt ſatisfaction, 1. That my *argument* no way depends on the falling of *Iohn Baptiſts*, day on *Mid-ſummer* day, and only mentioned it to ſhew the *agreement* betwixt them. 2. That if *Chriſtmas* day were not *celebrated* till the end of the 2d *Century*, it could not with any propriety be called *Mid-winter maſſe*, for *An.* 200. the *Winter ſolſtice* was certainly at a pretty diſtance from the 25. of *December*. 3. That though now *Mid-winter* day be a *fortnight* ſooner then the 25. of *December*, yet in the *Apoſtles* times it was not ſo, and ſo that is an *argument* for, not againſt the *obſervation* of it in, or neer the times of the *Apoſtles*, for elſe it could not with any truth be called *Midwinter day*.

4. By this time I hope the *Diatribiſts* eyes may be opened to diſcerne ſome force in this *argument*, and how nothing he hath *replied* to it.

Sect. 6.

Feſtivals not Romiſh. *The primitive Churches pure from the hereſies that ſollicited them; The* Romiſh *corruptions not fetcht from them.*

1. IN the next place he proceeds to my two *inferences*, the former of which being only this, that the *antiquity or immemorial uſage of any feſtival in our nation doth no way argue that it hath any of the corruptions of the Romane See adhering to it, but the contrary*, It is freely granted by him: And then I may for once *congratulate* the unexpected ſucceſſe of that *Paper*. For it ſeems the uſe of *Feſtivals* is not *Romiſh* and *Antichriſtian*, on the ſcore of which he certainly knowes ſome who have caſt them out, and

I foreſee not how he will ever approve himſelf to them again, after this one confeſſion.

2. However he will make no delay to make ſome *reparations*, For though *feſtivals* have none of the *corruptions* of the *Roman See* adhering to them, yet, ſaith he, *they may have too much of the corruption of thoſe Churches wherein they were firſt invented, corruptions which crept into thoſe Churches not long after the Apoſtles days, and the* Romiſh *religion is a bundle of moſt of thoſe corruptions.*

3. To which I anſwer, that nothing could be more *unjuſt* at once and *improbable*, then what is here without either *proof* or *diffidence* ſuggeſted againſt the *moſt ancient Primitive* (and *next to Apoſtolical*) *Church.*

4. That there were many *foul* and *dangerous errors* which very early, even in the *Apoſtles* days, ſolicited and infeſted the *Church*, there is no doubt; that impure deteſtable ſink of the *Gnoſticks*, and the ſeveral ſorts of *hereticks* which all joined together under that title; But then tis moſt evident that the *Governors* of each *Church*, by the ſtrength of that *depoſitum* committed to them by the *Apoſtles*, uſed all care to ſecure their *flocks* from ſuch *peſts* as theſe, and were by *Gods* bleſſing ſucceſsful in it, *noted*, *branded*, *expulſt* theſe *hereticks*, and kept the *Catholike Church* intire from their *corruptions.*

5. And then as it is moſt incredible that thoſe *Churches* that cenſured theſe *corruptions*, ſhould be *infected* with them, ſo nothing can be more *unjuſt*, as well as *uncharitable* and *impious*, then to *affix* that *character* on the *Churches*, which belonged only to the *hereticks* that *diſturbed* and were *ejected* out of thoſe *Churches.*

6. By this account the *Apoſtolical Churches* themſelves, whileſt the *Apoſtles* preſided in them, might be blaſted alſo, for we know there was in their very time a *myſtery* of *iniquity*, πλάνοι *deceivers* and *Impoſtors*, *Antichriſts*, and *falſe teachers* good ſtore, but, as S. *John* ſaith of theſe, that *they went out from us, ſeparated* from the *Churches*, and ſo diſcovered that *they were not of them*; So it was alſo after the *Apoſtles* death, the *hereticks* and *ſchiſmaticks* infuſed not their *corruptions* into the *Church*, and ſo they cannot with truth be imputed to thoſe that were preſerved *pure* from them, the *corruptions* of the *enemies* of the *Church*, unto the *Churches.*

And

7. And however the *Doctor* have been accuſed ſometimes of *complying* with the *Papiſts*, I am confident he never let any thing fall which yielded them ſo true and *ſolid* advantage, as this one *affirmation* of the *Diatribiſt*, *that the corruptions, of which the* Romiſh *religion is a bundle, are thoſe which crept into the Churches not long after the Apoſtles days*: For what is that, but an *agnition*, that the moſt *accuſed Romiſh practices* now adays are the ſame which were *delivered* to them from the *Primitive Church*. For my part I proteſt my *diſſent* (and ſo ſure doth the whole *Church* of *England*, and every true *ſon* thereof) to this *concluſion*.

Sect. 7.

The grounds why this Feaſt may not be aboliſht among us. The Diatribiſts miſtake of the queſtion.

1. MY 2d *inference* now followes, that *any ſuch ancient uſage of this particular Church, if it had no other ground to ſtand on (as its foundation) or concurrence of all Chriſtian Churches (as pillars) to ſuſtain it, were a very competent authority for the preſent continuance of ſuch a practice in the Church, and that* upon this *ſcore*, becauſe the *Anglicane Church being one of thoſe which by its foundation is* αὐτοκέφαλος *ſubject to no forein Patriarch, is conſequently inveſted with unqueſtionable power to inſtitute Ceremonies for it ſelf, which conſequently may not without great temerity be changed or aboliſhed by any.*

2. To this, becauſe I ſee there are ſome pages of *objections* inſerted by the *Diatribiſt*, before I read them over, I deſire it may be *adverted*, wherein the force of my *inference* conſiſts, *viz.* in theſe 3 things, 1. that this particular *Church* of ours being firſt *planted* by ſome either *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon was thereby conſtituted αὐτοκέφαλος of *abſolute power* within it ſelf, as that excludes *ſubjection* to any other *forain* power.

3. 2dly That in all probability this *feaſt* was ſet up, or *celebrated* here, by thoſe that *firſt planted* the *faith* among us, *i. e.* by ſome

Apoſtle or *Apoſtolical* perſon, by *Simon Zelotes* or by thoſe 12 which were ſent higher by *Philip* the *Apoſtle*, and *Ioſeph* of *Arimathea* one of thoſe.

4. 3 That what was by ſo good *authority* introduced, having no equal reaſon to *ſuperſede* it (ſuch as was the *contrary tradition* of other *Apoſtles* in the buſineſſe of *Eaſter*) may not without *temerity* now be *aboliſhed* by any; not by any other *perſon* or *perſons*, *Pope*, or *Conſiſtory*, becauſe no *other* hath *power* over a *Church* which is *ἀυτοκέφαλος* *founded* by the *Apoſtles*, and not ſubjected by them to any; not by the *Church* it ſelf, which cannot now be ſuppoſed to have any ſuch *perſons* in it, as may be fit to *compare* with the *firſt founders* of it, at leaſt, not without ſome greater reaſon for the *changing* and *aboliſhing*, then they may appear to have had for the *uſing* of it.

5. Upon theſe *grounds* my *inference* being built, as is there apparent by the *premiſſes*, and the very *expreſſions* cautiouſly uſed in ſetting it down, let us now ſee what the *Diatribiſt* hath to *object*; And 1. that it is *ἀυτοκέφαλος* by its *foundation*, he willingly grants, ſubordinate to no *forain Patriarch*, I ſhall only demand whether it be *ſubordinate* to its own *ſons*, or to any but the *legal Fathers* of it? I hope it will be as reaſonable for me to preſume it is not, as it was for the *Diatribiſt* to *grant* the former, for elſe M.C. a *ſon* of this *Church* by deveſting the *Pope* of his *authority*, ſhall only have *removed* and *veſted* it in himſelf, and ſuch as he, tranſlated it from the *Papacy* to the *Presbyterie*, which I hope he will not profeſſe to do, leſt that be the very *crime* which was charged on our *Biſhops*, that they *aſſumed* to themſelves the *Papal power*, or the *power* of *ordaining ceremonies*, which ſure is no greater then that of *aboliſhing* them.

6. Having made this grant of the *ἀυτοκεφαλία* of this *Church*, it is obſervable what he preſently *interpoſeth*, *Yet*, ſaith he, *we juſtly queſtion whether it be inveſted with ſuch unqueſtionable power to inſtitute what ceremonies it pleaſe, which may not upon good reaſons be changed and aboliſhed* In which very *form* of propoſing his *queſtion* or *exception*, tis viſible what *change* he hath thought fit to make in my *inference*, when I ſpake of the *power* of this *Church* to *inſtitute ceremonies for it ſelf*, I never affirmed of thoſe *ceremonies* once *inſtituted* that they might not *upon good reaſons*

be

be changed and aboliſhed, for I doubt not but the ſame *power* which may on *good reaſons inſtitute*, may on *good reaſons aboliſh* alſo; But *firſt* I deſired to *examine* the preſent *reaſons* of *abolition* of this *Feſtival*, whether they were as *important* as thoſe whereon this *Feſtival* was ſuppoſed to be *inſtituted*, viz. that of the *pious* and *thankful commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt*; and withall 2. whether thoſe *reaſons* pretended for *abolition*, were not *faigned reaſons*, as thoſe taken from the heads of *Will-worſhip*, and *Superſtition*, have, I muſt hope, been evidenced to be: or again 3. whether they might not otherwiſe be *ſatisfied*, as that of the *riot* (charged only as a conſequence accidental to the *Feaſt*) by *care* and exerciſe of *diſcipline*.

7. To which conſiderations may 4thly be farther added this reaſonable *aphoriſme* of *Chriſtian policy*, that what was thus brought in on ſuch grounds by the *governors* of a *Church*, ſuppoſing them but ſuch as are of an ordinary rank of *governors*, and not the *Apoſtolical founders* of the *Church* (to whom certainly *more reſpect* is due) may not be caſt out by *ſons* of the *Church*, or indeed by any *other* then the *authority* of the *ſucceeding Governors*.

8. And theſe few *conſiderations* I ſuppoſe, may competently evidence the *unreaſonableneſſe* of this *changing* the tearms of the *queſtion*, it not of his *plea* for the *abolition* of the *Feſtival*.

9. And therefore whereas, upon this *occaſion*, he enters into a *large diſcourſe* concerning the *power* of the *Church* to *inſtitute ceremonies*, I ſhall take leave to paſſe it over untoucht, it being certain that the two branches of the one *propoſition*, for which I *contend*, are no way concerned in any *part* of his ſtate of this *queſtion*, nor indeed any thing with the leaſt *probability ſuggeſted* againſt either, *viz.* 1. that a *National Church planted* by the *Apoſtles* or their *ſucceſſors* may *lawfully* uſe a *feſtival* for the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt*, and on it *pray* to, and *praiſe God* in the *ſolemn aſſembly*, preach out the *word* and *Sacraments*, *exhorting* all good *Chriſtians* to partake thereof and to lay aſide their ordinary *labours*, that they may be vacant for ſuch *holy exerciſes*; and 2. that when ſuch a *pious uſage* hath gained a *reception*, either from the time of the firſt *planting* of the *faith* among us, or however by *immemorial cuſtome* (all other *Churches* in the world for very many *hundred years*, and for ought we can diſ-

cern, from the very *Apostles* practice, concurring with us) it ought not to be *declaimed* against, as *Antichristian*, or *laid* aside, or *covenanted* against by this *Diatribist* or others, persons not *in* but *under authority*, upon no weight of *solid* reasons, but upon some *causeless suggestions*, that it is *criminous*, under the head of *Will-worship* and *Superstition*.

10. This was so plainly set down before, to be the whole matter in *debate* betwixt me and any *gain-sayers*, that there was nothing left to the *Diatribist*, but briefly to point at the *weak* part, if there appeared to be any such in either branch of this *proposition*, and having nothing from him to this purpose, I shall now omit to take notice of the *infirmities* of which this *discourse* of his is as full as from any writing of no greater *length* may well be expected, and hasten to his following §§. in hope of *springing* somewhat more *pertinent* to our *controversie*.

Sect. 9.

The Reformation in this Kingdome. No imperfection in it in point of Festivals. The States joyning in it no disadvantage to the Church.

1. MY 10th §. proceeded to some few *considerations*, the adverting to which might render this *change* or *abolition* of the *Christmas Festival* more *unreasonable*; As 1. that this *observation* was an *undoubted part of that establishment which the Reformation in this kingdome enacted for us, and that by act of Parliament, and not only by Church Canon.*

2. To this he answers two things, 1. That *the Reformation was not so full as the Reformers themselves could have wisht*; Never considering how far this is from being *applicable* to the point in hand, For I shall demand, Did all or any of the *Reformers*, to whose *piety* and *temper* we ow our *establishment*, ever expresse their *wish* that all *Festivals*, particularly this of *Christmasse* should be *abolished*? or did they not? If it shall be said, they did

did, I then preſſe that the *Record* may be produced, by which this hath been *notified* to the *Diatribiſt*; But if he *confeſſe* they did not, or offer no *proof*, that they did, then what is it to this matter of *feſtivities*, wherein only our preſent *debate* is concerned, if in other things of a quite *different* nature, as that of bringing all *notorious ſinners* to *penance* every *Lent*, mentioned in the *office* for *Aſhwedneſday*, they *wiſht*, and expreſt their *wiſh*, that the *Reformation* were more *perfect*? The *rule* in *law* is ſeaſonable to be here applied, *Exceptio firmat in non exceptis*, Their expreſſing their *wiſh* that other things might be more *perfect*, gives us aſſurance, that they *wiſht* not any farther *change* in this *particular* of *feſtivals*, then that which they made in the *Romiſh Calendar*.

3. This *anſwer* therefore had little of *advantage* for him, and yet his only *Reſerve* is, that 2. *this ſeems to grant that the Reformation was made by the State and not by the Church, which now is pleaded for.*

4. And I pray what is that to the *diſadvantage* of the *Church* that the *State* joined with it in the *Reformation, confirming* and *eſtabliſhing* it by *Act* of *Parliament*; or 2. why is that the *fitter* to be *aboliſhed* which ſtands by *Statute law*, as well as by *Eccleſiaſtical Canon*, and *Cuſtome immemorial*; or 3. how doth the *Parliaments confirming* the *Liturgie*, and therein the *feſtivals*, inferre that this *feſtival* was not firſt *introduced* by the *Church*, when it is moſt evident that the *Feſtival* was in the *Church* long before that *Act* of *Parliament*?

5. Theſe indeed are all the *anſwers* we can have to an *argument*, which ſeemed to have been of ſome force with a *friend* of *Parliaments* or *eſtabliſhed lawes*: and therefore we muſt content our ſelves with them.

Sect. 3.

The Lutheran *Churches accord in this.* Morney's *wish.* *The* Helvetian *confession.* Rivets *custome of preaching on the day.*

1. MY 2d *consideration* was, that *this and other feasts of Christ are retained in the reformed* Lutheran *Churches, and where they are taken away, wisht for by sober members,* as *Ph: Mornay Du Plessis,* and *approved by the confessions of those Churches* as the *Helvetian,* and in *other places the day of Christmas afforded the solemnity of a Sermon.*
2. To this he *answers,* that *the* Lutheran *are not reputed the best reformed Churches, nor by the Doctor,* he believes, *thought fit to be compared with* England, *and so not fit precedents for our Reformation.*
3. But sure he might have marked that the *Lutheran Churches* concurring with the *English* in this of *Festivals* tis no way to the *disparaging* of my *argument,* that I do not *compare* the *Lutheran Churches* with that of *England*; Tis certainly sufficient if they and the *Church* of *England* together may be able to *compare* with all *other reformed Churches* which have *cast* out all *festivals* as *superstitious* or *Antichristian*; And thus I shall, without much insolence, adventure to make the *comparison.*
4. As for the little regard he is pleased to give to such *private* persons *wishes,* as that of *Ph: Morney Du Plessis,* I may reasonably reply, that how *fastidiously* soever he reject it, it may very well be allowed to keep the *practice* of the *Church* of *France* from being any example or precedent to us, when the *prime* members of their own *Church* have expreſt their *dislikes* of it.
5. And I pray why was not the *Helvetian confession* worth his taking *notice* of? that was no bare *wish* of a *private* man, but the *approbation* of a *Church,* which Mr. *Calvin* thought fit to *write* to for their *judgement* and *suffrage* to his *new erected model* at *Geneva.*
6. As for the passage of *giving Sermons* to *Christmas* day, I see it

it is miſtaken by him, and applied to, as ſpoken of himſelf and ſuch as he in their *former practices*, and upon that *miſpriſion* it is, that he is ſo much concerned to have *their prayers as good and as large as the Liturgies*, (by the way, if they be not much *better*, and ſure alwayes to be ſo, why muſt the *Liturgie* be *aboliſhed*?) whereas all this while I never thought of him, or ſuch as he, which it ſeems, kept fair with *Chriſtmas* (from whence I am in charity to believe they thought it not Superſtition) till they had an advantage of *ejecting* it, and then made all ſpeed to cloſe with the *opportunity*, but of ſome other *preachers* in other *Churches*, where this *Feſtival* was not *obſerved*, ſuch as *Andrew Rivet* in the *Low Countreys*, who, as I have been informed, conſtantly preacht on that day to his *auditors*, which was a *civility* fit to be mentioned to thoſe that will now perform that *office* on any *day* of the *week*, rather then on *that*.

Sect. 10.

Ejecting feſtivals. Separation from the pureſt times, even thoſe of the Apoſtles. Our Churches departure from Rome *unjuſtly paralleld with the departure of ſons from our Church.*

1. MY 3d *conſideration* was, that *the raſing this Feſtivity out of the Calendar is an act of ſeparation from the Church of* England, *and the univerſal Church of all ages, eſpecially of the firſt and pureſt times.*

2. To this he *anſwers* by denyal of *both parts*, *Not the latter having proved*, as he ſaith, *that the firſt and pureſt ages of the Church did not obſerve it*, *Not the former, unleſſe I yield that the Reformation of the Church of* England *was a diviſion and ſeparation from the Church of* Rome, *or the reformation in* Luthers *time a ſeparation from the Catholike Church, as Papiſts ſay it was.*

3. But for the former of theſe, it is ſufficient to reply by way of *demand*, where it is that he hath ſo *proved* this of the *firſt* and *pureſt*

pureſt ages not obſerving *feſtivals*, that he can affirm it *certain* that this of *diſuſing* or *laying* them down is not *ſeparation* from the *Church* of thoſe ages? Truly my *eyes* or my *memory* very much fail me, or he hath not as yet *proved* it in any *degree*, much leſſe ſo demonſtrated it that a *Corollary* deduced from thence, and depending on that probation, ſhould deſerve to be *pronounced certain*.

4. Nay ſure there hath yet been no *occaſion* offered him (at leaſt made *uſe* of by him) to attempt ſo *impoſſible* a thing, as is ſuch a *negative probation*. Of this I am ſure, that for this *Feſtival* and that other of *Eaſter* the reaſon muſt be the ſame, and I have already made it as *clear* as the *day*, that that was obſerved by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, by *Philip* and *John* on the *Iewiſh* day, and by *Peter* and *Paul* on the *annual Dominical*; And if through the *dimneſſe* or *want* of *ſtories* of thoſe times, this be not ſo evident of this *particular Feaſt* of *Chriſtmaſſe*, yet the *analogy* holding directly betwixt the *one* and the *other*, the *argument* remains as *firm*, that the laying aſide either *this* or that *feſtival*, is a *ſeparation* from the *Apoſtolick*, and thoſe ſure are the *firſt* and *pureſt* times.

5. Beſides I have as clearly ſhewed that the *ſolemnities* and *feſtivities commemorative* of the *Martyrdome* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, two *Biſhops* that lived in the *Apoſtles* times, were *obſerved* from the very times of their *deaths*, and that in compliance with other the like *feſtivals* of the *Church* before them, which muſt needs come home to the *obſervation* of *feſtivals* in the *Apoſtles* days.

6. And then how can this *Diatribiſt* flatter himſelf that he hath *proved* the *contrary* to this, when he hath not ſo much as offered either the leaſt *anſwer* to theſe, or any the leaſt *reaſon* or *proof* of his *negation*?

7. For the *latter*, I reply, that there is no *analogie* betwixt the *Church* of *Englands departing* from *Rome*, and the *Diatribiſts departing* from the *Church* of *England*, I might inſtance in many, twill be ſufficient that I ſhew it in two particulars, 1. the *Church* of *England* in the *Reformation departed* not from their *lawful ſuperiors*, being, as the *Diatribiſt* acknowledges ἀυτοκέφαλος, and owing no *ſubordination* to the *Church* of *Rome*, when ſhe *departed* from her, whereas the perſons then ſpoken of by me, and the

Dia-

Diatribiſt for one, were certainly *members* that ought a *Chriſtian obedience* to the *Church* of *England*, as *inferiors* to *ſuperiors*, and ſo departed from their *lawful ſuperiors* wherein *Schiſme* doth *principally* conſiſt, as hath elſewhere been ſhewn.

8. Thoſe things wherein the *Church* of *England reformed*, and *departed* from the *Romiſh opinions* and *practices* were none of them ſuch as this of *feſtivals* now appears to be, *i. e. common uſages* of the *Univerſal, ancient*, eſpecially of the *Primitive pureſt Church*, but *innovations* unduely brought in by them, and *impoſed* on all *Chriſtians*.

9. And as even now, ſo again this *Diatribiſts confeſſion* here, is more to the *advantage* of the *Romiſh Church*, then any thing that he could likely have ſaid, no way clearing his *fact* from *Schiſme*, nor offering the leaſt *colour* to it, and yet acknowledging that the *Church* of *Englands reformation*, and ſo *Luthers reformation* alſo, was as truely an *act* of *Schiſme* from *Rome*, as is theirs from the *Church* of *England*. But I muſt put in my *proteſtation* of *diſſent* to this *propoſition* alſo, and that is all I need to ſay to that anſwer.

Sect. 11.

The profaneneſſe objected to the Feſtival. Caſting out the Creeds.

1. HIS *anſwer* to the 4th *conſideration* is ſo ſlight, and therein ſo little on which to faſten any reply, that I may ſafely intruſt the Reader with it, and only minde the *Diatribiſt*, 1. that till he hath more *ſolidly* proved the *obſervation* of this *Feſtival* among us to be *ſuperſtition*, then hitherto he hath done, twill be great *uncharitableneſs* thus to accuſe it, and greater *injuſtice* to deſtroy the *innocent* for this (if it were *true*, yet but) *accidental* and *removable* crime imagined to be *adherent* to it.

2. And 2. till he hath written as full a *tract* of *profaneneſs* as he hath done of *Superſtition*, and been more ſucceſſefull in his *evi-*

dences that this *Festival* is guilty of it, shewed that that is derived from *super statutum* also, or evinced the same thing by some more sensible way of *probation*, tis but a *pitiful begging* of the *question*, thus *irrationally* to *accumulate crimes* on *innocency*, to adde the *Profaneness* to the *Superstition*, to suppose the *Festival* able to work *miracles*, to *reconcile* the most *contrary extremes* (as if in the vein of *declaiming* he should call the same man first *Papist*, then *Socinian*) for such he knows are *Superstition* and *Profaneness*.

3. In stead of which it were much more *seasonable* for him sadly to *inquire*, which is most liable to the charge of *profaneness*, the setting apart a *festival* from *common uses* to the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Christ* in *Prayer*, *Praises*, *Eucharist*, hearing the *word* read and *preached*, and *profiting* by all these; or the *fastidious* refusing to joyn with the *Church* of *God* in all or any of these *offices* at that time, following the *Plough*, or attending the *Shop* in stead of it.

4. And I shall with the same *seriousness* desire him to review his words p. 147. Where in *answer* to my mention of *disusing* the *Creeds* and *Catechisme*, he saith, in a *parenthesis*, that the *Creed* is still to be retained in and with the *Catechisme*] and demand whether he doth not know, that the same *Tempest* that carried away the *Festivals*, swept away (more then one) the *three Creeds* received from the *ancient Church* and retained in our *Liturgie*, and together with them the *Church Catechisme*, of which, he knowes, I spake.

5. And then what truth can be in his *parenthesis*, unless it be only this, that these are still retained in *our Books* (which they have joyned to *condemn*) though they be not retained in *their offices*, but solemnly *ejected* by them. Such *equivocal answers* or *responses* as these he knowes from what *oracles* they were wont to be *delivered*, and therefore should not be imitated.

Sect.

Sect. 12.

The Diatribiſts change of my words, his cauſleſſe praiſe of himſelf, and cenſure of others.

1. HIS 14th §. is ſomewhat of the ſame making, for when I ſpake of that *deeper knowledge of ſome, which was ſome degree above the vulgar ignorance*, and yet was *obſervable* to be *impatient of ſound doctrine, to be ready to imbrace any thing that was novel, and contrary to the ancient faith and Principles*] he anſwers, that the *impatience of ſound doctrine, and readineſs to imbrace any thing that is novel, is not to be found in thoſe of deep or ſound knowledge.*
2. But why ſhould he there inſert the word [*ſound*] can he imagine that I ſpake of thoſe of *ſound knowledge*, when I ſpake of *impatience* of *ſound doctrine*, Twas viſible enough that I ſpake of thoſe, which while they *leſſe ſeemed to want ſuch helps* as *Chriſtmaſſe ſervices* and *ſermons* to *teach* them the *ſound doctrine* of *Chriſt*, did yet moſt really *need* them to cure the *vanity* of their *own minds*, and their *itch* of any thing that was *novel*.
3. By this tis alſo manifeſt how little *temptation* he had to break out into thoſe *Eulogies* of himſelf and his *friends*, to which certainly I never *conſtrained* him by thoſe words that belonged not to the *Paſtors* but only to their *auditors*, who when they have attained to ſome meaſure of *knowledge* above the more *ignorant*, are yet experimented to be very *fickle* and apt to fall off into *new doctrines*.
4. However, let him not *flatter* himſelf as he doth, that thoſe that *ejected* theſe *Feſtivities* under *pretence* of *Reforming abuſes* of *ſuperſtition* and *profaneneſſe*, are the men *only or chiefly that propugne and maintain ſound doctrine, when*, as he goes on very *glibly, thoſe that were the greateſt favourers of thoſe Feſtivals, are fallen into Arminianiſme &c. or do little appear to maintain the truth.*
5. I wonder what a *Phariſee* could have ſaid more in his *ſolemneſt Magnificat*; He, forſooth, and ſuch as he, are the men that *only*

or chiefly propugn and maintain ſound doctrine, and who can doubt it when he hath thus affirmed it of *himſelf*? and *all others* are but as this *Publicane*, for ſo this *new ſtyle* of *Arminian* bears proportion with that *ancient*; and whoſoever will not think as this *Diatribiſt* doth, that *Feſtivals* are forbidden in the 2d and the 4th *Commandments*, that will favour *ſlaviſh fear*, or *mercenary obedience*, or ſuſpect that *grace* may be *received in vain*, muſt preſently fall under that *condemnation*; and then the beſt that can be ſaid of them is, that they doe *little appear to maintain the truth*.

Sect. 13.

His 2d change of my words. Gedeons *golden Ephod not appliable to Feaſts.*

1. SO again when I had mentioned the *deſigns* of this *ſolemnity*, no other then to *teach* us what we have *received* in *Chriſt*, and aſſiſt us to render *God a pious publick acknowledgement* of it, He is pleaſed not to *underſtand* this, but to interpret it (contrary to the expreſs words) of the *deſign* in the firſt *inſtituters* of this piece of *ſervice* to *Chriſt Jeſus*.

2. And to what purpoſe was this *change*? why, to make the *example* of *Gedeon's golden Ephah* applicable to it, *in the making of which*, ſaith he, *though Gedeon's deſign was very fair to leave a monument of his victory, yet it proved a ſnare to him and his houſe and all Iſrael*.

3. From which notable *example*, no doubt, it follows that every *Feſtival*, or what ever elſe is deſigned as a *publick pious acknowledgement of the Chriſtians thankfulneſs to God*, is to be lookt on as a *ſnare* to *all* the *people* of *God*, and ſo upon all *reaſons* of *piety* to be *aboliſhed*.

4. And there were no way of reſiſting this *concluſion* thus inferred, if our *common notions*, or *Logick* had not warned us that *particular premiſes* would never induce a *concluſion*, and that *examples*

examples are not always *argumentative*, For then indeed the *Lords day* which is ſuppoſed to have been *deſigned* for all theſe *good ends*, muſt upon the ſame *account* be *aboliſht* alſo.

Sect. 14.

Strictures on his 16th §. Our Feſtivals unfitly compared with the Romiſh. How obſervation of Feſtivals may be a duty of the 5t Commandment. The fourth Commandment no way contrary to Chriſtian Feſtivals. Veniall ſinnes. All miſtakes not ſinnes. Chemnitius not producible againſt me.

1. HIS 16th §. is long, in making good his *charge* of *Superſtition* and *Will-worſhip* againſt this *Feſtival*, And it is certain that I have been *large* enough on theſe *ſubjects* already, as far as any thing that he could *ſuggeſt*, appeared to have the leaſt *force* either againſt *ceremonies* in *general*, or *particularly* this of *Feſtivals*, and therefore I ſhall not ſtill bind my ſelf and the Reader to that *ungratefull penance* of drawing the ſame *Saw* for ever, Yet if any thing ſhall now be afreſh *objected*, I ſhall not omit to take *notice* of it.

2. As 1. When to free it from all *appearance* of *Will-worſhip*, I ſay that *thoſe that retain the uſage, obſerve it in obedience to the Laws of the Church*, he hath great diſpleaſure to this, 1. Becauſe I *ought firſt to have proved that they which inſtituted that Feſtival had a Lawfull power to do it*, adding that *the Papiſts may uſe the ſame argument for obſervation not onely of their Holy days, but of their invocation of Saints, adoration of images, and the Maſs it ſelf.*

3. But to this I anſwer, 1. That my *not proving* of this was founded in my *ſuppoſing* it. And the *reaſon* of that *ſuppoſition* elſewhere competently *explained*, that as *Magiſtrates* in *generall*, ſo *particularly* the *Governors* of a *Church* have an *inveſtiture* of *power* from *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*, whoſe *ſucceſſors* they are, to *ordain* and *inſtitute* ſuch *circumſtances* of the *publick worſhip*

of *God*, as are *times* and *place* and *gesture* and the like, in order to *decency*, *uniformity*, and the *benefit* of their *Churches*.

4 And 2. That this *Diatribist* can again think fit to *compare* this with the *Papists observing* their own *holy days* &c. is interpretable as a far greater *kindness* to them, then I have ever been *guilty* of, For the plain inference is this, 1. The *Church* may command in *lawfull* things, therefore it may as well do so in *unlawfull*. 2dly There is no more *unreasonablenesse* in *besainting* all those that are gotten into the *Romish Legend* and *Calendar*, and consecrating several days to the *commemorating* of them, then in *commemorating* the *birth* of *Christ* himself. 3dly It is as *lawful* to *invoke* all the *Romish Saints*, as publikely to *pray* to and *praise Christ* on the 25th of *December*. 4thly It is as safe to adore *images*, and the very *bread* in the *Masse*, as to *adore* and *commemorate Christ* on that day. What could *passion*, or *interest*, or ἀμετρία ἀνθολκῆς, or τὸ δουλεύειν ὑποθέσεω, have *suggested* more unadvisedly then this?

5. His 2d *dislike* and *exception* is, that having *formerly founded times or dayes designed to publike worship, on the equity of the* 4th *Commandment, I should now devolve the observation of this festival to obedience to the lawes of the Church*, and so reduce it as a *duty to the* 5th *Commandment*, and upon this, as an especial *advantage*, he is pleased to *expatiate*.

6. But the matter is *clear* enough, and was so, till he had taken pains to *involve* it. The *difference* is very *conceivable* and *intelligible* betwixt *time* or times for *Gods service* generally considered, and this or that *particular time*. That *God* should have some *times* assigned for his *service* is of the very *law* of *Nature*, and so much of *morality* there is *fundamental* to the *positive precept* of the *weekly sabbath* in the 4 *Commandment*: Nay farther, the 4th *Commandment* being given to the *Iewes* for the observing *one* day in *seven*, as a *fit* and moderate *proportion* of time to be required of every *Jew*, it might equitably be inferred that a *Christian* should at least set apart *one* day in *seven* for our great *Christian* purposes, the *first* day of the *week* on which *Christ rose* from the *dead*, And accordingly I suppose it *instituted* by the *Apostles* of *Christ*.

7. But then as among the *Jewes* beside the *weekly sabbath* required

red by the fourth *Commandment*, they had many other times of *feſtivity*, and *faſting*, ſome appointed by *God* himſelf in the time of the θεοκρατία, others inſtituted by *men*, and yet conſtantly obſerved by *Gods people* and accepted by *God*, and ſome approved by *Chriſt* himſelf, and all this without any *prejudice* to the fourth *Commandment*, though not by any force of that, ſo now ſtill under the *Goſpel* nothing hinders, but that the *Church* of *God* by the *power* left to, and depoſited with them, may ordain *Chriſtian feaſts*, and *faſts*, and obedience be paid thereto by all dutiful *meek* ſons of the *Church*, and this obedience be in them that are thus under *authority* no act of *Will-worſhip* or *ſpontaneity*, but of *honour* and *obſervance* to this *ordinance* of the *Church*, and ſo a *duty* of the fift *Commandment*.

8. As for that which he addes in this matter, that *we Chriſtians are by Chriſt reduced to the fourth Commandment, as for one day of ſeven to be holy, ſo for our allowance of ſix daies for our own works*, 1. It hath not the leaſt *appearance* of truth in it, for where did *Chriſt reduce* us to the *fourth Commandment?* and tis viſible what the conſequence muſt be in *affirming* it, even an *obligation* to the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, for that certainly was the *ſubject* of the fourth *Commandment*.

9. 2. It is no way pertinent to the matter in hand, for ſuppoſing *Chriſtians* allowed *ſix* daies for their *own works*, tis yet viſible that ſome of theſe *ſix* may by the *free* act of particular *men* be *uſed*, or by the *power* of the *Chriſtian Church* be ſet apart to *Chriſtian uſes*, as well as ſome days were (not only by *God* himſelf, but) by the *Governors* of the *Jewes*, *Judas Maccabeus*, and others, ſet apart for the publike *ſervice* of *God* in the *old Teſtament*, at which time tis by all confeſt that the *fourth Commandment* was in force, in all parts of it.

10. A ſecond *exception* I ſhall note in this §. *p.* 157. when upon theſe words of mine concerning the *poſſible miſtake* of the *day*, that *that will be pardonable in thoſe that verily think they are not miſtaken, and that in them that do performe the buſineſſe of the day as compleatly on a miſtaken day as on the true, the excuſe of blameleſſe ignorance will waſh away greater errors then this*,] he preſently replies, *Does not this ſound ſomewhat like the Papiſts doctrine of venial ſins?* and upon that occaſion is put in minde

of

of *Bellarmines defence againſt the peril of idolatry in the Maſſe, in caſe the bread be not tranſubſtantiated*: And then he askes, *Can any ignorance be blameleſſe againſt the Law of God, or waſh away any error without the blood of Chriſt?*

11. But to this the anſwer is obvious, and the *fallacy* preſently diſcoverable, For 1. he that talks of *venial* or *pardonable ſins*, muſt not be preſumed to exclude the *blood* of *Chriſt*, thoſe ſins are *pardonable* under the *Goſpel* for which that λυτρον was paid, and ſuch are all *ſins* that are *reconcileable* with true *repentance*, or the *ſincerity* of a *regenerate* ſtate.

12 But then 2. I am no way aſſured that it is a *ſin* ſo much as of *ignorance*, to *miſtake* in the *day* of *Chriſts birth*; every *miſtake* is not a *ſin*, but only that which is a *breach* of ſome *law*, and therefore I ſuppoſe it is, that the *Diatribiſt* was compelled to ſay, *Can any ignorance be blameleſſe againſt a law of God?* But then I profeſſe not to know any *law* of *God*, againſt which it is a *ſin* (though but of *ignorance*) to *miſtake* that *day* for the *annual day* of *Chriſts birth*, which really is not the *day*.

13. And I now deſire to be informed of which of the *ten Commandments* or any other *law* of *Gods* in the *Old* or *New Teſtament* this is a *breach*. When he tells me this, I ſhall attend him more *diligently* to the *remainder* of this *Section*, and anſwer his inſtance of ſo *weighty* conſideration about the very day of the *Jews paſſeover*, of which he acknowledges that the *very day was as ſtrictly commanded as the buſineſſe it ſelf*, and ſo the *error* muſt be an *error* againſt a *law*, whereas he as certainly knowes that this *day* of *Chriſts birth* is by none ſo much as pretended to be ſo *commanded*.

14. What remains concerning *Chemnitius*'s charge of *Superſtition*, on *Papiſts* obſervation of their *holy daies*, is all anſwered before it be produced, by this one conſideration, that *Chemnitius*, as a *Lutheran*, is by the *Diatribiſt* confeſt to allow this and other *Feſtivals*; For then hath he granted all that I contend for, who undertook not to be *advocate* for the *Legend* or *Calendar* of the *Papiſts*.

Sect.

Sect. 15.

Of riot. Chriſtian joyes no way contrary to our Feſtivals. Riot as ſeparable from Chriſtmas as the Lords day. Heathen cuſtomes cannot be objected. Gods judgments vainly urged for arguments. The charge of want of hoſpitality on thoſe that retain feſtivities. The hoſpitality at Chriſtmas a pledge of it all the year after. Reformation of exceſſe without abolition of the Feſtival. Attempt to reform, previous to abolition. The Agapæ no example for aboliſhing Feſtivals. Cures for diſeaſes, exciſions only for deſperate ſpreading evils. No cards on Chriſtmas day, as much ſtrictneſſe on Chriſtmaſs, not more ſacredneſs then on the Lords day. No deſign of making the Lords day no inſtitution of the Apoſtles. Neither Superſtition nor hypocriſie in abſtaining from Cards on Chriſtmas day.

1. WHat now followes in the 17th §. and ſo on to the 27. is all to the head of *Riot*. Which I was careful to remove from this *Feſtivity*, And firſt having diſclaimed it as *more intolerable in a Chriſtian then in a Jew*, and that upon this account, that *Spiritual joyes* are his *eminent if not only portion under promiſe*, His anſwer is, that *theſe are not limited to one or twelve dayes in a year, but are daily joyes, every day is a Chriſtmas to a godly heart; Rejoyce in the Lord always* &c.
2. But he that thus anſwered, could not but know, that the *weekly Lords day* is ſet apart for a *Chriſtian Feaſt* dedicated particularly to theſe *Spiritual joyes*; and that this was very reconcileable with the *text* that ſaid once and again, *Rejoyce always*, and how then can this be oppoſed to an *annual Feſtival?*
3. Beſides, all that I had to ſay, was, that the *Chriſtian joyes* ſhould principally be *Spiritual*, and this not as a proof of the *lawfulneſs* of *Feſtivals*, but of the *unlawfulneſſe* of *riots*, and the *Diatribiſts* anſwer is wholly to that other head, to which that was never deſigned as a *medium*.

To which I might 3dly adde, that that *text* to the *Philippians* is

an *exhortation* to *rejoycing in tribulations*, in the *saddeſt* as well as the *cheerfulleſt* ſeaſons, and ſo the *alwaies* is to be limited by the *context*; And then the application of it here was ſtill ſo much leſs *pertinent*.

5. In the 2d place, my 18th. §. being deſigned to ſhew how *ſeparable* all *riot* was from this *Feſtival*, by the nature of *Chriſtian dainties*, *inſtruction*, *prayer*, *praiſes*, *almes*, and the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* (none of which were capable of *luxurie*) and *Feſtivity* and *Hoſpitality*, which were clearly *ſeparable* from it; His anſwer is, 1. that *theſe two laſt are thus ſeparable from riot, but very hardly*; And I ſhall only demand, Are the *leaſure* and *ceſſation* from *buſineſs* on the *Lords day*, experimented to be more *eaſily ſeparable* from it? Is it more *ordinary* for the ſame men to be *drunk* upon *Chriſtmas day*, then upon all, or upon any one *Sunday* in the *year*? And have not *preachers* and *magiſtrates* been as *induſtrious* to caſt out this *profane* Spirit on the *Lords* day and been as *unſucceſsful* in their *indevours*? And ſhall this be any *argument* for the *abolition* of that *day*?

6. Next, ſaith he, *the heathen uſages in it* (*almoſt yielded* §.2.) *as they imply that the feſtival was inſtituted to gratify the heathen, ſo God to ſhew his diſlike of them, hath ſuffered them to be attended with two extremes of true worſhip, ſuperſtition and profaneneſs.* But to this I ſay, 1. that the *heathen uſages* were no way *yielded* §. 2. but only an *argument* uſed *ad homines* that ſo affirmed. 2. If there were *heathen uſages* in it, thoſe would no way imply the *Feſtival* to have been *inſtituted* to *gratifie* the *heathens*, It was *inſtituted* to the honor of *Chriſt*, and the *heathens* were farre enough from being *gratified* with that, and tis *ſufficient* if the *converted heathens*, among whom it was *inſtituted* by their *converters*, did of themſelves aſſume ſome of their *Gentile cuſtomes* by them thought *innocent* in the *celebration*.

7. 3dly Tis great *preſumption* and *intruſion* into *Gods ſecreteſt Counſels*, to ſay that *Gods ſuffering this Feſtival to be attended with ſuperſtition or profaneneſs* was to ſhew his *diſlike* if not *deteſtation* of it; For who revealed this *counſel* of *Gods* to this *Diatribist*? Beſides, how eaſily might this *argument* be retorted on the *Lords day* by a *Jew*, and all the *riot* and *unprofitableneſs* of *hearers* on that day be made an *evidence* of *Gods diſ-*

like

like if not *deteſtation* of the ſetting apart of this *day* to his *ſervice*? What impiety of any *Sect* would want *arguments* to ſupport it, if ſuch as theſe might be admitted? Now laſtly, the matter of the preſent debate being only that of *riot*, what had *ſuperſtition* or *profaneneſs* (either or both) to do with that?

8. His 19th §. is the accuſing thoſe *who keep up and cry up the cuſtome of the feſtivity, yet have taken liberty to lay aſide hoſpitality and charity not only at the time, but all the year long.* To which it is ſufficient to *anſwer*, that then it ſeems, their *hoſpitality* is not the occaſion of *riot* to any, and that is a *competent* means of *vindicating* the *feſtivity* ſo farre from that part of the *accuſation*, which now we have before us.

9. But then 2dly it were perhaps worth *examining* what degree of truth there is in the *ſuggeſtion*, and in what inſtances it is founded; ſomething like this he had once *ſuggeſted* before, and I had then *thought* that it was not worthy taking notice of, But now the returning of it again more ſolemly makes me ſuſpect there may be ſomewhat in it; And having no other *clue* to introduce me into his *ſecrets*, and the *charity* and *hoſpitality* of thoſe that have caſt off the *feſtivals*, and with it their *obedience* to the *Church*, beyond thoſe that have retained both, having never been ſo *notorious*, that I could take *cognizance* of it, and the writing a *Diatribe* againſt all *freewill oblations* in a *Chriſtian*, being no vehement *indication* that thoſe in whoſe *defence* it was written, were very *eminent* in the *exerciſe* of thoſe virtues, I began to pitch upon one thing that might of late have yielded ſome ſhew of truth to his *obſervation*, *viz.*, that the *condition* of many mens worldly plenty hath been ſo *changed* of late, that the men have been forced to *abate* ſomewhat of the *degree* of that *charity* and *hoſpitality* that formerly they had both *ability* and *will* to exerciſe, and that theſe fall out to be the men that *retain obedience* to the *Church* of *England*, and ſo *keep up and cry up the feſtivals of the Church*, though they are not able to *keep up* the *good cheer* of it in that degree, which formerly they have done.

10. And if the *Diatribiſt* was willing to take notice of this *turne* of the *tyde*, and being himſelf one of the *proſperous* party that had caſt off *obedience* and *feſtivals*, but retained *hoſpitality* and *charity*, was willing to compare himſelf with others who being *depri-*

ved of all their *revennes*, were not likely to hold up their *hoſpitality*, then ſure this is a way of *anſwer* which might ſoon be *retorted*, if *juſtice* were allowed to take place, and every man were *reinveſted* in his own again.

12. In the mean, thoſe that are deprived of *ability* to be *charitable* on one ſide, as to be *occaſions* of *riot* on the other, if they muſt be *reproacht* for their defects in one, ſhould not in *reaſon* be accuſed for *exceſs* in the other: And that is all I ſhall reply to this *anſwer*.

13. Unleſſe to the 2d part of it I reply in a word, that the *hoſpitality* attendant on this *Feſtival* was never by me defined or imagined, and is with no *juſtice* by him ſuppoſed to be a *miſers feaſt*, nor know I any the leaſt *neceſſity* that it ſhould be followed with a *neglect* of *charity all the year after*, but rather that it be lookt on as a *copy* which the whole *life* of a *Chriſtian* is to tranſcribe from this manner of *ſolemnizing* the *birth* of *Christ*, as a *firſt fruits* of this *duty* then paid, as a *pledge* of the *future* harveſt, as a *ſolemn entrace* on that *duty* then, which in ſome degree is to be *exerciſed* all the year after.

14. In his 20 §. having in the firſt part of it deſired no more of me, then that in *caſe of notorious abuſe I will believe there is place and ſeaſon for reformation* (which I moſt *willingly* yield, being, as he knowes, as *inclineable* and deſirous as he or any man, that all *exceſſes* ſhould be *reformed*, and never *indured* among *Christians* of all other men in the *world*) his *concluſion* hath very fairly taken in one *term* more then was in the *premiſſes*, and to *reformation* of *exceſſe*, annexed of the *Feſtivity* it ſelf, meaning evidently, according to the *modern ſtyle*, *abolition* by *reformation*; For elſe, after all his *dexterities*, it will not do his *buſineſs*.

15. For that all *exceſs* ſhould be *aboliſhed*, that the *Feſtivity* ſhould be drained from all ſuch *unchriſtian mixtures*, and reformed in that meeker ſenſe, was viſibly the deſigne of the *Section* to which this of his was *confronted*; And that, it ſeems, will not ſerve the turn, but as if *reformation* were never *reformation*, unleſſe like the breaking in of the *Ocean* it ſweep and carry away all before it, as if our *Dictionaries* were to be changed, and that word were to be *gloſſed* by nothing but *vaſtation* and *depopulation*, all that I had

ſaid

ſaid of *reformation* of *exceſſes* ſignifies nothing with him, unleſſe the *Feſtivity* it ſelf be *reformed* alſo, and that juſt as *Epiſcopacy* was to be *reformed*, by being *turned* out of the *Church*.

16. And all the reaſon which is offered for this (viz. *becauſe the Feſtivity hath ordinarily been attended with ſuch miſchiefs without the leaſt attempt of reformation*) if it have any the leaſt *truth* in it, is viſibly a *reaſon* for the *contrary*; For is it not madneſſe to *deſtroy* the *vineyard*, before any *leaſt attempt* hath been made to *dreſſe* or *manure* it, to *cut down* the *tree* before ever it was once *digged* about? were it *reconcileable* with any *tolerable ſobriety* to *aboliſh* the *Lords day* upon any, much more upon *ſuch* an *account* as this of *riot* and *drunkenneſſe* ordinarily attending it, without ever giving the *offender* the *firſt* or *ſecond admonition*, without ever *attempting* to *reform* it? Certainly the *rules* of *ſober* diſcipline are directly the *contrary*, to *attempt* and diligently *indevour* the *reformation* of the *exceſs*, and never to proceed to *ſeverer* remedies, till the *evil* is experimented to be not only *obſtinate* but *deſperate*, and yet then too, to divide betwixt the *nocent* and *guilleſſe*, and not involve both in the ſame *condemnation*; And *arguments* muſt ſure be very *ſcanty*, when thoſe come to be uſed for the *affirmative*, which were proper only for the *negative*; And yet thus is it at this time with the *Diatribiſt*.

17. But his 21th §. offers us an *example* of this *deſtructive*, *exterminative reformation*, S[t] *Paul's diſcipline on the feaſts of charity by way of deſtruction and abolition*, *when they began to be* abuſed to ſurfetting *and drunkenneſs*. 1 *Cor.* 11. 17. But herein are good ſtore of *miſtakes*, For 1. If that place to the *Corinths* be examined, it is moſt evident that it was the *Lords Supper*, into which that *exceſs* was crept, and accordingly as he tells them, v. 20. that *this is not to eate the Lords Supper*, ſo for the *reforming* of what was amiſs, he tells them what the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* was in it, and there expreſſely ſets down the *firſt inſtitution* of the *Lords Supper*, *In the night he was betrayed he took bread*, v. 24. &c. And then I muſt demand, did S[t]. *Paul deſtroy* and *aboliſh* this *feaſt* wherein theſe *abuſes* were obſerved? if he did, he *aboliſht* the *Lords Supper*, and then here is indeed an *inſtance* home to his purpoſe: But if he did not, why did the *Diatribiſt* tender us this *inſtance*, when he knows

that *drunkenness* and most unworthy behaviour at the *Sacrament* never suggested to the *Apostle* the least thought of *abolishing* or *disusing* the *Sacrament*.

18. But then 2. To grant him the utmost that he can wish in this matter, *viz.* that there were *two* parts of this Κύριον δεῖπνον, *Lords Supper*, one in taking a *morsel* of *bread*, and *tasting* the *wine*, in *commemoration* of *Christ's body* and *blood*, another in *eating* and *drinking* together more *liberally*, after the former was done, and that this latter is it which is meant by *Agapæ* in S. *Jude*, and that this latter was taken away out of the *Church*, upon the too common *unreformable abuses* of it; yet still this is nothing of advantage to the *Diatribist*; For still this will but conclude that the *carnal external* part of the *Festivity*, the *eating* and *drinking* part, should fall under this *discipline*, not the *Spiritual* more *Christian* part, and tis evident one of these is as *separable* from the other, as the *Sacrament* from the *Agapæ*.

19. And thus much was willingly yielded to his hands in that §. to which his *instance* of the *Love-feasts* was opposed, and tis certain no more can *rationally*, by any *analogie*, be concluded from it.

20. Nay 3. It was not possible any instance could have been brought more fitted for *my* turn (and so I hope not for *his*) then this of the *Agapæ*. For when this *disorder* at *Corinth* had brought this attendant on the *Christian festival* under some *censure*, it was thus *reformed*, (as appears in *Justine Martyrs Apologie*, where he sets down the whole *course* of the *office*) The *offerings* were not *lessened* by this means, but otherwise *disposed* of, and that which was not *eaten* at the *Lords Table*, was kept in a *common bank* for the *poor*, the *Stranger*, the *Fatherless* and *Widow*, and a very competent *provision* was made for all by this means.

21. And so truely in like manner, if upon a just *inquiry* it be found that the *Christmass liberality* and *hospitality* still ends in *riot*, and that there is no hope of *restraint* to be laid upon it, as it runnes in that *channel*, It is most obvious and easie for every *sober Christian* to turn the *stream* another way, to lay aside for *reliefe* of the *poor*, that which was usually laid out in the *extraordinary entertainments* at this time, and as that is the utmost,

to

to which the *ſeverity* uſed on the *Agape* can extend, or ſuggeſt, ſo it is the very thing which was propoſed §. 20. but it ſeems cannot yet ſatisfie this *Diatribiſt*.

22. What in 22th §. he cenſures in me as *pretty untempered mortar*, will not, I believe, be found ſo, in any *ſober judging*. Tis onely this, that *though the eating and ſporting part of this feſtivity be ſtrictly to be kept within bounds and as ſtrictly to be reformed wherein it hath been diſcerned to exceed* (this had been ſet down before, and was now *ſuppoſed*) *yet for abolition of all hoſpitality and recreation*, or ἄνεσις *remiſſion* (as *Nazianzen* ſtyles it) *at theſe times it was to be lookt on as a laſt remedy, and ſo not proceeded to till the diſeaſe were univerſally ſpreading* and *obſtinate* againſt all *cure*, for whileſt it were lower then ſo, it was ſtill but the *ſeaſon* of *reformation*.

23. From whence that the *Diatribiſt* ſhould think fit to infer it my ſenſe (that he might accuſe me) *that leſſe or leſſe generall abuſes need no reformation*, there can be no tolerable account rendred, but only this, that his *ears* have been ſo accuſtomed to the new *dialect*, that of *exterminative reformations*, that he cannot think the word ſignifies any thing elſe, by whomſoever it is uſed, but (that which indeed it never ſignifies in any *propriety* of *ſpeech*) *extirpation* and *abolition*. In a word, I think there is no neceſſity of *exciſion* till the part begin to *gangrene* or *corrupt* and *ſpread*, yet I can admit of *medicines* long before, and heartily adviſe *timely* prudent *applications*, as ſoon as ever the *patient* begins in the leaſt meaſure to be *diſtempered*.

24. His 23th §. is the accuſing of thoſe that uſed *cards on the Lords day after the evening ſervice*, and the upbraiding their *ſuperſtition* that they will not *touch cards or dice on Chriſtmas day*; and the anſwer is ſufficient, that as I ſpake not a word of them that did thus, ſo I never heard of any that thus made a *difference* betwixt *Chriſtmaſſe day* and the *Lords day*, but that if they uſed that *liberty* on the *later*, they uſed it on the *former* too; However if by the *Diatribiſt* it were deemed *criminous* in the *one*, I ſhould have hoped he might have been gratified by hearing it was *abſtained* from in the *other*: For my own part I never allowed my ſelf the *liberty* on either, and know not that I ever ſaw it uſed, and therefore I am ſure there is nothing farther to be replied to by me in that §. I as heartily

heartily with a devout, conſcientious, profitable *obſervation* of the *Lords day*, as of any other *Feſtivity*, and cannot juſtly fall under the *Diatribiſts* cenſure for any thing I have ſo much as intimated in this matter.

25. And this I ſay the rather, becauſe §. 24. this is charged upon my *doctrine* as a *crime*, and a *part* of *ſuperſtition*, that the *day* hath been accounted *more ſacred then the Lords day*, and the proof brought out of my 20th §. where ſaith he, I call it *moſt ſacred*, and out of my 24th §. where I ſay *it hath been kept if not much more, yet certainly as ſtrictly as any Lords day in the year.*

26. But here is *miſpriſion* in each of theſe; The phraſe *moſt ſacred* §. 20. doth not at all belong to the *day*, (much leſſe to the *preferring* it before the *Lords day* in reſpect of *ſacredneſſe*) but only to a *Chriſtian Feſtivity*, as that is made up of *prayer, praiſes, Euchariſt, charity, hoſpitality*, &c: All which being put together I hope I could not offend in ſtyling it *moſt ſacred*, ſuch as the *extravagant, irrational riots* of men ought not to *aſſault* and *pollute.*

27. And for the 2d, there is no ſuch word as *ſacred* to be found in that 24th §. all that is ſaid is, that *in this nation the day of the birth of Chriſt hath been kept* (*if not much more*) *certainly as ſtrictly as any Lords day in the year*, and this interpreted moſt clearly by the following words) *in frequenting the ſervices of the Church, in the uſe of the Liturgie, Sermon, Sacraments*, &c. And I cannot imagine how this manner of *ſtrict obſerving* of it can be *criminous* in it ſelf, or to the *prejudice* of the *Lords day*, on which tis no news to ſay that the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, which I make an *ingredient* in the *ſtrictneſſe* of the *celebration*, and that which denominates it *more ſtrict*, is not conſtantly *celebrated*; and yet ſure no *fault* that it is conſtantly *celebrated* on *Chriſtmas* day.

28. However the *ſtrictneſſe* of *obſerving* is one thing, and the *ſacredneſſe* is another, Any private *faſt* may be more ſtrictly obſerved, more, or more *ſevere ſtrictneſſe* of *duty* allotted to it, then to the *Lords* day, and yet the *Lords* day, as ſet apart by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, in reſpect of that *inſtitution*, and of the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, to the *commemorating* whereof it was *conſecrated*, be *eſteemed* and lookt on as *moſt ſacred*. I need to ſay no more of that.

As

29. As for the *ground* which he pretends from his own knowledge, to aſſigne of my thus ſpeaking: *viz.* that we may *make the Lords day and Feſtivals to be founded on the ſame authority*, viz. of the *Church*, this he muſt very much diſſemble his *knowledge*, if he confeſſe not to be a *miſtake* alſo.

30. For in the *margent* he grants that I ſay that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day* §. 31. and ſo certainly I do (though I know not in what words of *Scripture* that *inſtitution* is ſet down) But, ſaith he, there be other words §. 57. which ſpeak of the *Lords day* by the *ſame authority appointed*. To which I anſwer that the words there uſed [*though the Lords day be by the ſame authority appointed*] belong not at all to the *ſtating* of this *queſtion*, and being introduced in that form [*though* &c.] they are not any *affirmation* that the *Lords day* is not *inſtituted* by any *higher authority* then *Chriſtmas day*, but only a *conceſſion* of what was asked by the *Quæriſt*, without ſo much as *examining* or *inquiring* into the *utmoſt* of the *authority* by which it ſtood. Of this I had ſufficiently expreſt my ſenſe §. 31. as the *Diatribiſts margent* confeſſes from me, *viz.* that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day*, whereas in that 57th §. I ſpeak as plainly of *Chriſtmas day*, that it hath its *authority* from the *inſtitution* and *uſage* of the *Univerſal Church*; And if when the matter is ſo clear, and my meaning ſo expreſſe both for the *one* and the *other*, I muſt yet be accuſed for the *contrary*, and this be affirmed from the *Diatribiſts knowledge* to be my ground, *viz.* a *deſigne* to make the *Lords day* and *Feſtivals* to be founded on the *ſame authority*, and that by him ſpecified, *viz. of the Church*; Tis certainly moſt viſible, that either this is a *calumny* in the *Diatribiſt*, or elſe that the word *Church* muſt be ſo taken as to comprehend that part of it, of which the *Apoſtles* were *rulers* in perſon, and then what harm hath been in that *ſpeech* thus interpreted, the *Church* of the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day*, and either they *perſonally*, or their *ſucceſſors* uſed and delivered down the other *Feſtivals*, the *Feſtival* of *Eaſter* being derived undoubtedly from the *Apoſtles*, *Philip* and *John*, *Peter* and *Paul*, as hath already clearly appeared out of the *difference* betwixt *Victor* and *Polycrates*; And other *Feſtivals* by the paſſages of the *Martyrdome* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, i. e. by evidence of *ſtory* being demonſtrated to be

little later, though of *Christmasse* this do not so expressly appear to me as to be any where *affirmed* by me.

32. But there is yet more of this captious discourse behinde upon my saying that tis *not usual to touch cards or dice on Christmas day*, and this must *adde either to our superstition or hypocrisie, our superstition, if they be lawful, in that they forbid them on that day, that God hath not forbidden them; Hypocrisie, if they be unlawful, in abstaining then, and yet using them on other days.* But we shall soon be extricated from the power of this *Dilemma*, by affirming, 1. that those *sports* used *moderately*, as *diversions*, and no way *abused* by our *inordinacy*, are not by any *argument* that ever I met with, proved to be *toto genere*, or *absolutely unlawful*, and so that they may be used for *divertisement* on other *days*, and particularly on the following days of that *Festivity*, and yet 2dly that they are no way *necessary*, and so that no man *offends*, that *abstains* from them on *all other* days, and employs himself better *constantly*.

33. From whence it is necessarily *consequent* also, that he that hath *fed* on the *body* and *blood* of *Christ*, and *consecrated* himself in an *extraordinary* manner to *commemorate* the *mysterie* of our *redemption* on *Christmas day*, and agreeably thereto, desires to spend it so much more *strictly* then other dayes, as not to *admit* those *sports* (which are *lawful* on *other* days) to divide any part of that, can never be *criminous* in so doing.

34. As for any thing of *riot* (but such is not all *lawful divertisement*) on the *following days*, he knowes they are no way pleaded for by me, and if any be *guilty* of them, as the *shame* thereof is due to the *offenders*, not to the *festival*, which is *innocent* and *laudable*; so tis too well known that the *Lords day* it self hath not been secured from the same unhappy *adherence*.

35. And it might as well be charged on that that the *heathens* worshipt the *Sun* on that day, and that *revelling* upon it are fitter for such *heathen feasts* then for *Christians*, as the *Diatribist* could suggest in this place that *the Saturnalia were celebrated about the same time that Christmas was, and that the excesses of the following dayes are services fitter for the revels of* Bacchus *and* Saturn *or the birth day of* Herod, *than for the festivity of a spiritual Saviour.* All this is *true*, and *equally* granted by *both* parties,

and

and ſo hath no *propriety* or *pertinency* to the *diſpute* between us.

Sect. 16.

Chriſtmas, if of the ſame original with Eaſter, certainly Apoſtolical. However, of the practice of the Primitive Church. All rendring of motives no λόγ& σοφίας.

1. MY 27th §. was *introductory* to a diſcourſe more *general*, to ſhew by what *authority*, *feſtivals* in *general*, and *particularly* this of *Chriſtmas*, pretends to ſtand in the *Catholike Church*, which I acknowledged not to be by any *inſtitution* of *Chriſts*, but to have had the *beginning* from the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church*.

2. To the view hereof he now proceeds, and briefly ſets to it, to diſprove each of theſe *originals*, beginning firſt with that of the *Apoſtles*. And of this he thinks he need ſay no more, then to *appeal* to the ſame *arguments* which he had uſed againſt the *Apoſtles inſtitution* of *Eaſter* §. 6. *viz.* 1. the no mention of ſuch *inſtitution* in the *Scripture*; 2. the *expreſſe words of* Socrates, *that neither* Chriſt *nor his* Apoſtles *commanded the feaſt of* Eaſter *to be obſerved*.

3. But to both theſe it is certain that I ow no *return* having now paid it ſo *punctually* in the 4th §. where beſide clear *anſwers* to the *Diatribiſts* arguments, I added *evidences* undeniable that the *feaſt* of *Eaſter* was *obſerved* by the *Apoſtles*, And I cannot doubt but they will be of force with him, when he ſhall take leiſure to *weigh* them; And then if the caſe ſhall be acknowledged the ſame betwixt *Eaſter* & *Chriſtmaſſe*, that of the *reſurrection* & this of the *birth* of *Chriſt* (as the *Diatribiſt* ſeems to acknowledge in tendring no one argument more againſt the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of *Chriſtmaſs*, then he had before produced againſt the *inſtitution* of *Eaſter* by them) then it is evident my *affirmation* muſt aſcend *higher* then it ever meant to have done, and not proceed *disjunctively*,

tively, that this *feast* of the *nativity* is derived *either* from the *Apostles* or the *succeeding Church*, but leaving out the *latter* part of the *partition*, fix upon the *former*, that, being yielded to have the same *original* with *Easter*, it is certainly *derived* from the *Apostles*, from whence it appears that of *Easter* is *derived*.

4. To which purpose we have already produced some *evidences* which may justly pretend to some force, at least *ad hominem*, to him that hath no more against this, then against all other *Christian festivals*, viz. those from the *martyrdomes* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, written by those that were *present* at them, and so lived soon after the *Apostles*.

5. That of *Polycarps* recorded in that *famous Epistle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, I have set down at large, and made my *inferences* from it §§. 33. and 34. of that *treatise* of *Festivals*, To which I have here formerly added that other *parallel testimony* from the acts of *Ignatius*.

6. So that now I hope I may safely resume my former *affirmation*, without all *diffidence*, that other *Festivals* beside that of the *weekly Lords day*, were derived to us, some certainly from the *Apostles*, others from the *Church* immediately succeeding the *Apostles*; In one of which ranks though I have no reason to doubt but this of the *Nativity* of *Christ* is to be placed, yet because we have not those *evidences* of the *fact* which we have for *Easter* and others, I shall not build upon any degree of *uncertainties*, nor affirm more then what that *treatise* hath shewed out of the *ancient Fathers*, that this *feast* is deduced to us early from the *first antiquity*.

7. And against this I am sure neither *Socrates* nor my *L.* of *Falkland* (who is joyned next to him) hath *suggested* any thing; & then what was thus done by them, must not in *equity* fare the worse for my adding the mention of a motive or incitement that might reasonably *recommend* it to them, which is therefore presently styled λόγῳ σοφίας, *a shew of wisdom*, as if all *reasonable* motives were to be blasted under that *title*, as all *uncommanded performances* here are said to be by the expres's words of the 2^d *Commandment*, & *Col.* 2. 23. But sure we have formerly spoken enough of this *arguing*.

Sect.

Sect. 17.

The Encænia, a religious feaſt inſtituted by the the Iewes, and approved by Chriſt, vindicated from all his exceptions. Marriage feaſts. Religious feaſts cannot be unlawful, if civil be lawful. The feaſt of Purim a religious feaſt.

1. THE 29th §. proceeds to conſider what I had ſaid of the *Encænia* among the *Jewes*, the *feaſt* of *dedication* not *inſtituted* by *God* in the *Law*, but in *commemoration* of the *purging* of the *altar* by *Judas Maccabeus*, and yet this *obſerved* by the *Jewes*, and approved by *Chriſts preſence* at it, *Joh:* 10. 23.
2. To this the *Diatribiſt anſwers*, that *there may be many miſtakes in this*, And truly it matters not how *many* there *may* be, as long as there appears not to be any *one*.
3. Firſt then his anſwer is, that *there were three feaſts of dedication, and I cannot but know that learned men are divided of which it's here meant.* But how can this firſt *anſwer* be of any *avail*, when I that took notice, as he confeſſes, of the *three*, made it evident that the place was meant of the *third*, that *inſtituted* in the *Maccabees*, and the *Diatribiſt* cannot deny but *it's probable ſo it was*, and offers not to *anſwer* the *proofs*, or to *pretend* ought for either of the *two* former againſt this.
4. His 2d anſwer is, that *granting it to be the laſt, yet there are reaſons to think it was not a religious Feſtival but a civil, as the feaſt of Purim ſeems to be, Eſth:* 9.21,22. But it is not *imaginable* the *Diatribiſt* ſhould thus think, or be perſwaded by theſe *reaſons*.
5. His *reaſon* is from the words 1 *Mac.* 4.59. They *ordered it ſhould be kept yearly with mirth and gladneſſe*, adding that *though it be ſaid* v. 56. *they offered burnt-offerings, yet that was* v.53. *according to the law, and ſo was worſhip commanded.*
6. Now truly this I thought had been ſufficient *proof*, that this was a *religious feaſt*, and it was great *ſurprize* to me to ſee it brought to inferre the *contrary*: For what greater evidence can there be brought of a *religious feaſt*, then this, of which out of the *Story* he

hath set down a considerable *portion*, but lies in the *Maccabees* more *completely* thus.

7. *Now on the 25th day of the Ninth moneth (which is called the Moneth Casleu) in the 148th year they rose up betimes in the morning and offered sacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt-offering which they had made; look at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even upon that was it dedicated with songs & citherns, harps & cymbals; Then all the people fell upon their faces worshipping & praising the God of heaven who had given them good successe, and so they kept the dedication of the altar 8 days, and offered burnt-offerings with gladnesse, and sacrificed the sacrifice of deliverance and praise &c.* and then *v.* 59. *Moreover Judas and his brethren with the whole congregation of Israel ordained that the days of the dedication of the altar should be kept in their season from year to year by the space of eight days from the 25 day of the moneth Casleu with mirth and gladnesse.*

8. And now I shall ask the *Diatribist*, Is there any reason to think this was not a *religious festival*, nay is it possible for him to give any *account*, why in setting down the passages of it, he should omit the *peoples falling upon their faces, worshipping and praising the God of heavens and sacrificing the sacrifices of deliverance and praise*, together with *Judas* and his *brethren* and the *congregation* (which is not *God*, as hath hitherto been pretended it ought to be from the 2d and 4th *Commandment*) *ordaining that it should be so kept* for the future *from year to year*?

9. Do not those passages take away all possibility of doubting, either of the *religiousnesse* of the *Festival*, or the *institution* by *man* and not by *God*? And is there now against all this any force in the words *v.* 53. [*according to the law*] which the *Diatribist* confronts to the mention of *burnt-offerings*, as an *answer*, or *reason*, why that which was *kept* with *burnt-offerings*, was yet no *religious feast*? May not *burnt-offerings according to the law*, such as the *Mosaical law* approves of, yea and commands to be used for *burnt-offerings*, be used in a *religious feast*? what was ever suggested by any *disputer* with lesse *appearance* of *truth* or *probability*? He knowes that in the *free will offerings* there were yet *laws* given by *Moses* according to which they were to offer,

and

and why should it not be so in a *feast ordained* by *Judas*? would he imagine that *illegal offerings* should have been sought out for it, to constitute it a *religious feast*?

10. Here sure was matter of *conviction* to the *Diatribist*, I shall not inquire why it did not *prevail* with him. Only of this I am sure, that if this *one* instance had been permitted to appear, what indeed it is, and now is visibly *demonstrated* to be a *religious feast instituted* by the *Church* of the *Jewes*, and not by *God*, and yet *approved* by him, there can never need any farther *evidence* to confute and demonstrate the *vanity* of all his *three Diatribæ* of *Superstitition*, *Will-worship*, *Festivals*, his suggestions from *superstatutum*, from *additions* to the *word*, from the 2^d and 4th *Commandments*, from *Col.* 2. whether as it mentions *Will-worship* or the *Commands* of *men*.

11. Our *Christmas festivity*, supposing the utmost that he can *wish*, that it was not observed by the *Apostles*, but *instituted* by the *Church*, be *two* or *three hundred years* after *Christ*, being perfectly answerable to this of the *dedication*, and so *demonstrated*, by *analogie* with that, to be approved by *Christ*.

12. And therefore it was but necessary that this *evidence* should by all convenient means be rendred *uneffectual*. All the *unhappinesse* of it was, that the matter would not yield any such, and so the *Diatribist* was to content himself with such as we have now *discovered*.

13. And because he could not but foresee it possible, that they would be thus *discovered*, and that *yet it will be* (more then) said *that it was a religious feast and so observed*, he therefore hath a 3^d *answer* in reserve, *Then* saith he, *it may be fairly suggested that they went beyond their commission in making this feast annual and perpetual, which neither* Solomon *nor* Zorobabel *did theirs, for ought we read*.

14. Here are again the clear *symptomes* of a *desperate cause*, that fain would *catch* at some *supports*, but is *forsaken* of all. Tis evident *Judas* and his *brethren* and the *whole congregation* ordained that it should be *kept* thus *from year to year*, 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. and as evident that it was *& observed* by the *Jews* even in *Christs* time, and as evident still that *Christ was present* at that *feast* (and so *approved* of and *confirmed* it) *Job.* 10. 23. And yet saith he, it *may be*

be fairly ſuggeſted that they went beyond their commiſſion in making this feaſt annual, what again could have been ſaid more *unluckily* then this, more *contrary* to *expreſſe* evidence in every degree of it?

15. Adde to this 2. that even both of the two other *feaſts* of *dedication*, at the *erecting* the *Temple* in *Solomons*, and *reedifying* it in *Zorobabels* time, if they were *annual*, were fully *parallel* with this, and that they were ſo, was by this *Diatribiſt* affirmed to be the *opinion* of *learned* men, in this very *page*, who, ſaith he, *interpreted the place of* John 10. *ſome of the one, ſome of the other of theſe*, which were *ridiculous* for them to doe, if it were not *annual*.

16. Nay laſtly, ſuppoſing theſe two were never obſerved above *once a peece*, I ſhall now demand, why might they not as *lawfully* be *celebrated often*, or *annually* and *ordinarily*, as for *one turn* and *extraordinarily*? If the *firſt* offended not by being *ſuper ſtatutum*, how could the *ſecond* or *hundredth* or *thouſandth* repetition render it *criminous*? Tis not imaginable what reaſon can be given for this, that what was *lawful* laſt year, ſhall be *impious* this year; what ground of ſo great difference, that one ſhould be *approved*, the other *condemned*, one not only *innocent* but *commendable*, and the other (*i.e.* the ſame *received* into *conſtant annual practice*) *repudiated* and *rejected*.

17. And yet in this, it ſeems, all the *difference* lies all this while, *extraordinary days of thanksgiving* for *one* turn ſaith he, *he accounts lawfull to be done by the higher powers*, and ſo *extraordinary days of humiliation*; From whence I conclude, that if King *Lucius* 1400 years agoe kept *Chriſtmas day* for *one* turn and no more, and ſo *Good Friday* alſo, he had the *Diatribiſts* leave to do it very *freely* and *lawfully*; But if when he had done ſo *once*, he ſhall offer to do it *again*, the next *year*, then Mr. *C.* muſt needs write *Triplicem Diatriben* againſt him.

18. What he yet farther addes as a *laſt miſtake* in me, will be ſoon found of the ſame rank with the former. *Another miſtake*, ſaith he, *is this, that that feaſt was approved and confirmed by Chriſts preſence at it, whereas*, ſaith he, *the text produced ſayes no ſuch thing, but only thus, It was at* Jeruſalem (*mark that, not at the Temple*) *not elſewhere, the feaſt of the dedication, and* v. 22.

Jeſus

Jeſus walked in the Temple, ſo he did other days, any day when no feaſt was &c.

19. I wiſh we were at an end of this kinde of *arguing*, for it will not eaſily be *paralleld* in any *Diatribiſt*. All that is by me affirmed from the *text*, is that *Chriſt was preſent at it*, the reſt is my *deduction* from thence, and I hope I have not *offended* therein. For is not that an evidence of *Chriſts approbation*, and ſo *confirmation* of it? would *Chriſt* have been *preſent* at an *unlawful*, nay (as this muſt be by the *Diatribiſts divinity*) *ſuperſtitious deteſtable* feaſt, wherein the 2d and 4th *Commandments* were directly *violated* by the very *keeping* of it, and never have reprehended it? would he not have *ſcourged* it and diſpatcht it out of the *Temple*, as he did that *huckstring* cuſtome of *buying* and *ſelling* there, and expreſt as great *impatience* againſt ſuch *ſuperſtitious* violations, as thoſe other *profanations* of his *Fathers houſe*? would not his *preſence* at the *Feaſt* have had the *ſcandal* of *ſuperſtition*, if the *Feaſt* it ſelf had had that *crime* in it?

20. What now he appoints to be *markt*, that this *Feaſt was at* Jeruſalem, *not at the* Temple, is very ſtrange. For if it were a *religious Feaſt* (as hath already appeared it was from the *ſtory* of the *inſtitution* in the *Maccabees*) then ſure it was in the *Temple*, and ſo at *Jeruſalem*, where the *Temple* was. And what if *Jeſus walkt in the Temple* on *other* days, *when no feaſt was*, doth it therefore follow that now it was not the *Feaſt*, when he *walked* there, and when the *text* ſaith expreſſely that it was the *Feaſt*? This is a new ſort of *arguing* ſtill, and this may be reiterated *more turnes then one*, and yet nothing *amiſſe* in it.

21. What hath thus farre been ſaid by him of the *Encenia*, is appliable, ſaith he, to my ſecond *inſtance* among the *Jewes*, the *feſtivities* of *marriage*. For *marriage* it ſelf, ſaith he, is a civil thing and not *religious*. But I ſhall not *engage* farther in new controverſies, having enow before me already (elſe ſure *mariage* might be approved to be *religious*) I ſhall only need to demand on this head of diſcourſe, what the *difference* is between a *civil*, and a *religious feſtivity*? I ſhall ſuppoſe onely this, that in the one the *publike ſervices* of the *Church*, among *Chriſtians*, *prayers*, *Pſalmes*, *Sermon*, *Euchariſt*, (ſome or all of them) are uſed, as among the *Jewes*, *ſacrifices*, &c. adding to theſe

feſtival diet alſo, whereas the other is made up only of the *latter*.

22. And then ſuppoſing one of theſe (as the *Diatribiſt* granteth) *lawfull* among the *Jewes*, and ſo among *Chriſtians* at the *celebration* of *mariages*, I ſhall demand how it is poſſible, the other ſhould be *unlawful*? Can the *ſervices* of the *Church* being added make that *criminous*, which was *innocent* before? Tis poſſible indeed for a *profane mixture* (ſuch as *riot*, &c.) to *defame* and *pollute* that, which is moſt *ſacred*, but have the *ſacred* offices of the *Church* that ſame *accurſed* force in them, to make that which was but *civil* before, *ſacrilegious* and *impious*? This is another rarity, that I had not formerly been *acquainted* with.

23. But before I leave this matter I muſt take in, what he hath in like manner *affirmed* of the *feaſt* of *Purim* among the *Iewes*, of which though having made mention in the *Practical Catechiſme*, I added no more in the *Treatiſe* of *Feſtivals*, yet there cannot be any thing more *pertinent* to our preſent *debates*, this being without any direction from *God*, voluntarily *inſtituted* by the *Iews* not only for *one* turn, but as an *eſtabliſhment* among them, on the 14th and 15th *day* of the *moneth Adar yearly*, *Heſt.* 9.21. Now of this he takes notice by the way §.29. (treating of the *Encænia*) and ſaith of it as of the other, that it *ſeems to be a religious feſtival, but a civil*; But this again without the leaſt ſhew of *probability*.

24. I ſhall need go no farther then the *text* to demonſtrate it, *Heſt.* 9. There *v.*16. the *Iewes had reſt from their enemies*, and thereupon *v.* 17. *on the* 13th *day, and* 14th *of the moneth Adar reſted they, & made it a day of feaſting and gladneſs* and v.18. *The Jews that were at Shuſhan aſſembled together on the* 13th *day, & the* 14th *day thereof; & on the* 15th *they reſted & made it a day of feaſting & gladneſſe*, and v.19. the *Iewes of the villages made the* 14th *day of the moneth Adar a day of gladneſſe and feaſting, and a good day, and of ſending portions one to another*, Here I cannot but ſuppoſe that a *day* of *reſt*, of *aſſembly*, of *feaſting*, and *gladneſſe*, a *good day* (*i. e.* in their ſtyle a *feſtival day*) a *day* of *hoſpitality* and *charity*, *ſending* of portions (μερίδας, ſuch as in a *ſacrifical feaſt*) will to any impartial reader paſſe for an *indication* of a *religious feaſt*.

25. And as theſe *days* were *obſerved* for the *firſt* turn, ſo they are *eſtabliſht* for a *yearly obſervation*, v.21.22. *And the Iewes ordained*

dained, and took upon them, and upon their ſeed, and upon all ſuch as joined themſelves to them, ſo as it ſhould not fail, that they would keep theſe two days according to their writing, and according to their appointed time every year, v.27.

26. What could be more expreſſe for the *religiouſneſs*, and for the *eſtabliſhment* for *continuance*; and this ſtill a *feaſt inſtituted* by the *Iewes*, and not by *God* himſelf, and ſo as clear an *inſtance*, on our ſide of the matter conteſted, as is imaginable.

Sect. 8.

How the compariſon holds between the Lords day and Chriſtmas day. Inſtitution, uſage Apoſtolical for Feſtivals. No law in Scripture for the Lords day.

1. NOw followes his view of what I had ſaid of the *Lords day*, not *inſtituted* by *Chriſt*, or *God* himſelf but by the *Apoſtles*, without any mention in the *New Teſtament* of any *preſcription* or *law* for the *obſerving* of it.

2. To this he is very glad to *proceed*, hoping for ſome great *advantage* from it; let us ſee what the *ſucceſs* will prove.

3. And 1. ſaith he, *there want not learned men who think that Chriſt did deſigne the day*. But I muſt demand whether he can imagine that thoſe *learned* men were in the right in this, or have herein *expreſt* any of their *learning*? If he cannot think they have, why doth he *loſe* time and gain nothing by the *mention* of them? If he can, why doth he not ſo much as offer their *grounds* of thus *opining*, when he knowes nor *Scripture* nor *antiquity* ſaith any thing of it, and when it were as tolerable in any *oppoſer* to offer his opinion alſo, that *Chriſtmaſs* day was by *Chriſt* himſelf deſigned alſo.

4. But then 2dly ſaith he, *if the Apoſtles did inſtitute it, that's more then he dare ſay of Chriſtmaſs day*. And what if it be? Doth that *prejudge* the *obſerving* of *Chriſtmaſs*, ſuppoſing it certain (as I do ſuppoſe) that it was either of the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding*

Church? Suppoſe ſome *feaſts* of the *Iewes* inſtituted by *God* or *Moſes*, others by the *Church* of the *Iewes*, and not by *Moſes*, as the *Purim* and *Encænia*, Are not theſe *latter* as lawfully to be kept to all *poſterity* of the *Iews*, as thoſe *former*?

5. But then 2dly the *parallel* that I ſet betwixt the *Lords day* and *Chriſtmaſs day*, was only this, that as neither of them was found *preſcribed*, or by *law commanded* in *Scripture*, ſo the *want* of ſuch *law* ſhould be no *prejudice* to the *one*, more then to the *other*, as long as by ſome other way it appeared of the *one*, that it was derived from the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church*, as of the other, that it came *immediatly* from the *Apoſtles*; It being evident that if the *Apoſtles uſage* gave to one a *divine authority*, the *uſage* of the *ſucceeding Church* muſt be next to that, though not *divine*, and the latter *lawful*, yea and *obligatory*, as *well*, though not in ſo high a degree, as the former, as the *Encænia* were as *lawful*, as the *Paſsover*, and were *obligatory* alſo, though not by the ſame *authority*. By this it appears that there is *certain obligation* for the obſerving of *Chriſtmaſs*, though there ſhould be no *certainty* of the *Apoſtles inſtituting it*.

6. Next he demands, *If the Lords day was inſtituted by the Apoſtles of Chriſt, do not their inſtitutions carry in them divine preſcription or Law*? I *anſwer*, that if by *inſtitution* be meant *giving Law* for the *obſervation* of it, then there is no doubt of his *propoſition*, the *predication* being *identical*, *inſtitution* in this ſenſe, is *preſcribing*, or *giving Law*.

7. But 'tis poſſible that *inſtitution* of the *Lords day* by the *Apoſtles*] may ſignifie another thing, *viz.* that the *Apoſtles practice*, *aſſembling* weekly on the *Lords* day, ſhould have the force of an *inſtitution*, or a *Law* with the *ſucceeding Church*, though indeed the *Apoſtles* gave no *Law* for it, or if they did, no ſuch *Law* appears from them.

8. The *examples* of the *Apoſtles* are the onely way of conveying ſome *uſages* to us without any their *preſcript Law*; And accordingly in this ſenſe alſo I conſent to the *Diatribiſt*, that their *inſtitutions* carry in them *divine preſcription* or *Law*, and ſo I ſhall no way *contend* with him in this matter.

9. Onely upon theſe *grounds*, I ſhall demand, that whatſoever elſe ſhall be in the *ſame* manner *derived* to us, through all ages of

of the *Church*, from the times of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, may be acknowledged alſo to carry a *divine impreſſion* upon it. And then, to omit *Epiſcopacy* (which he cannot but know hath perfectly as much to be ſaid for it in every reſpect as the *Lords day*) I ſhall inſiſt onely on the *feaſt* of *Eaſter*, which hath been demonſtrated to be *derived* from the *Apoſtles*, and ſo is an *inſtance* of all that I pretend in the point of *Feſtivals*, leaving *Chriſtmaſs* day to the *equity* of *proportion*, and the other *evidences* that are produced for the *antiquity* of it.

10. Next he proceeds to what I farther ſay, of the *no Law*, that appears in *Scripture* for the *Lord's day*. In order to which I ſaid, that *if any thing of that nature be ſought there, it will rather appear to belong to the annual, then weekly feaſt of the reſurrection*, naming 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. ἑορτάζωμεν *let us keep the feaſt*, and the mention of Κυριακὴ, *the Lords day*, *Rev.* 1. 10. *by ſome thought to belong to the annual day alſo.*

11. Againſt theſe he urgeth ſome *authorities* of ſome *ancient* and *modern* writers, which, ſaith he, *do not ſeem to underſtand theſe places thus.* And though twere no impoſſible thing to anſwer thoſe *teſtimonies*, yet I ſhall never *diſcourage him* in that very reaſonable courſe of *appeal* to the *judgement* of the *Fathers*, and other ſuch *Learned* men, but yielding him all he deſires of both theſe places, I muſt only deſire him to remember, that this will no whit *advantage* him or *prejudice* me, unleſſe he can bring out of the *Scripture* ſome *other places*, which are more *apodictical* evidences of *Apoſtolicall Law* for the *weekly Lords* day, then theſe are for the *annual*; For the matter is clear, all that I was there to *prove*, was no more but this, that there was *no Law* in *Scripture* for either of them.

Sect. 19.

Aërius's *heriſie that Feſtivals are unlawfull.* St Auguſtine's *teſtimony added to* Epiphanius's. *The Diatribiſts inconſtancy. The teſtimony of the Church of* Smyrna, *an evidence of keeping the days of the Apoſtles martyrdome. The Teſtimony from the martyrdome of* Ignatius *according with it. Teſtimonies for the antiquity of Feſtivals.*

1. IN the 32th §. to *Epiphanius*'s cenſure of *Aërius* as of an *heretick*, for *affirming feſtivals unlawfull*, his anſwer is, that *all is not hereſie that* Epiphanius *calls ſo, nor all* Aërius's *opinions juſtly cenſured as heretical.*

2. And ſo indeed the *Diatribiſt* is concerned to think, both in reſpect of this and ſome other *intereſts*, that eſpecially of *Epiſcopacy*. But for the averting of ſo great a *crime*, it would well become the *accuſed* to offer ſome *reaſon* for the *clearing* himſelf, and not onely to have mentioned the name of *Oſiander* the *Epitomizer* of the *Centuriators*, woſe words are not affirmed to belong to this particular of *Feſtivals*, and if they did, whoſe *authority* is ſure ſo Incompetent to weigh with *Epiphanius* in ſetting down the ſenſe of the *ancient Church*, that in all *reaſon* ſome *evidences* ſhould have been annexed to adde *weight* to him.

3. As it is, I muſt not thing *ſtrange*, that they which tranſcribe that *affirmation* from *Aërius*, will not allow it to be *hereſie* in him; I will onely demand whether St *Auguſtine* be of any better account with him, *Her.* 53. he knew what *hereſie* was, and what *Aërius* was *guilty* of, and whether elſewhere he may deſerve to be believed, when in conſort with himſelf and with *Epiphanius*, he ſaith, *Rectè feſta Eccleſiæ colunt, qui ſe Eccleſiæ filios recognoſcunt, they that profeſs themſelves ſons of the Church do duely obſerve the feaſts of the Church*, ſetting this of the *nativity* in the front of ſuch, where ſurely thoſe that do not obſerve them, muſt diſclaim their *ſonſhip*, and that is but a *paraphraſe* to expreſs thoſe, whom *Epiphanius* ſtyles *hereticks*.

• *Serm.* 253. *De Temp.* *Domin.* 1. *Adv.*

4. If he ſhall bring any ſo fair *evidences*, that they that *obſerve feaſts*

feaſts are *ſuperſtitious*, I ſhall think my ſelf obliged to do more then *deny* the *accuſation*.

5. For the *feſtivities* of *martyrs* mentioned by me in the ſame §. he acknowledges they *began betimes, as ſuperſtition*, ſaith he, *ever attends religion and devotion*, adding that *though they were intended for good ends, yet they produced in time much ſuperſtition*.

6. But ſure thi *anſwer* is very *unſufficient*, and *inconſtant*; *Unſufficient*, for what if it were granted that in a proceſſe of *time* theſe *feſtivities* did occaſionally produce ſome *evil*, ſo *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, ſo all things that ſhould have been moſt *for our wealth*, may through the vices of men be perverted into *occaſions of falling*; But what is that to the *antiqnity* of *Feſtivals*, which is the only thing that theſe inſtances were required to *teſtifie*.

7. And 2dly *inconſtant*, for at firſt theſe *feſtivities* are lookt on as *ſuperſtition attending religion and devotion* (and by the way, if that be applicable to theſe *feſtivities*, that will be a competent *character* of their *antiquity*, for *religion* and *devotion*, were brought in with *Chriſtianity*, and if the *Feſtivities* were the *ſuperſtition* that *attended* that, they will be pretty *ancient*) and yet in the latter part tis ſaid of them, that they *prodnced in time much ſuperſtition*, which latter if it be true, then the former which was *contrary*, is not true, and that is ſufficient to be replied to that *anſwer*.

8. As for his return to §. 33. which is of the ſame matter that I *preſume too much upon my own reaſon in concluding from the teſtimony of the Church of Smyrna, that the days of the death of the Apoſtles themſelves were ſolemnized thus early*, i.e. *before* Polycarps *death*] Sure his cenſure is not *over reaſonable*; For when by thoſe expreſſe words of that *Churches Epiſtle* it is firſt apparent, that *Polycarps* death was thus celebrated, 2. That this *Polycarp* was *immediate ſucceſſor* to the *Apoſtles*, and lived in the *ſame* time with them, 3 That this *commemoration* of *Martyrs* was before this time uſed in the *Church*, and no new thing now to be done to *Polycarp*; what reaſon of *doubting* can there be, but that at this time the *Apoſtles* having received (many of them) this *crown* of *martyrdome* ſhould be thus *commemorated* ἐν χαρᾷ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει *in joy and exultation*, i. e. with a *feſtivity*, when this appears

appears so expressely of *Polycarp*, and that in accord to *former practice*, especially when to that is added the instance perfectly parallel of *Ignatius*, yet more *ancient* then *Polycarp*, and the *day* of his death precisely observed by those that were *present*, on this very purpose, say they, *ut secundum tempus martyrii ejus congregati communicemus athletæ*, that they might assemble at the day of his martyrdome, and communicate with this champion.

9. That I produce not *more* or more *expres* testimonies for the *festivals* of the *Apostles*, need not seem *strange*, the *records* being so *few* which remain of those *times*, and my *reading* being so small; For the present, these two may be considered, being *testimonies* of *competent antiquity*, and *force* to prove what I pretend to prove, that *Festivities* were observed by the *Church* next *succeeding* the *Apostles*, and why *Polycarp* and *Ignatius* should have that *honour*, when *Peter* and *Paul* were *not* allowed it, I still professe not to discern *reason*, nor consequently to make any *doubt* of it.

10. Mean while when the *Diatribist* is willing to form an *argument* from my *not bringing* of *testimonies* §. 33. it is remarkeable that §. 34. is wholly past over in silence by him, which yet produceth the *authorities* of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, of *Cyprian*, of *Tertullian*, *ex majorum traditione* (and so of those that were much more *ancient* then he) and so intirely made up of *testimonies* of the *first antiquity* concerning the *memories* of the *Martyrs* (which must sure include the *Apostles*, as many of them as were thus *crowned*) before any *Churches* were built, wherein to assemble and *celebrate* their *Festivals*.

11. This shewes that the *Diatribist* had little reason to complain of *want*, at that very time when he was thus *overcharged* with *plenty* of *testimonies*, and hath not a word to return to any one of them, any more then he doth §. 35. to the mentions of *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Chrysostome*, deducing the *Christmass festivity* from the *first antiquity*.

Sect.

Sect. 20.

Strictures on §. 35. *The author of the Conſtitutions a competent teſtifier when in accord with others.* Juſtinus's *edict for Feſtivals reconcileable with the Apoſtolical uſage of them. The* 20000 *ſlain by* Diocletian *on Chriſtmaſs day. Objections againſt the* 25th *of December anſwered. The controverſie in* Chryſoſtome *about the day, not the Feaſt.* Ἀρχαία. ἀνωσιν. *His words full for the Apoſtolicalneſs of both.*

1. WHat now followes §. 35, is ſo far from having *weight* in it, that I muſt not *allot* any ſolemn *anſwers* to it, the *lighteſt ſtrictures* will be more *proportionable.*

2. As when of my mention of the *Author* of the *Conſtitutions* he ſaith, *this will weaken my cauſe the more, becauſe they are generally accounted ſpurious*, This ſure muſt be very *unjuſt*, that what was *confirmed* ſo newly from *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Chryſoſtome*, ſhould not only not *gain*, but *loſe* ſtrength by the *addition* of the *Conſtitutions*, which beſides that they are acknowledged *ancient* by all which leaſt believe them *Apoſtolical*, are known to be deſigned to *imitate* that *antiquity* they pretend to, and are never juſtly *rejected*, but when that which they *affirm* is found *diſcordant* to the *affirmations* of other writings of *undoubted antiquity*, which having no place here, there is as little room for the *Diatribiſts cenſure.*

3. So what he concludes from *Juſtinus's edict* (which I mentioned) that it was *a proof that the Apoſtles did not inſtitute it*, is already anſwered by ſaying that the *Apoſtles practice* being all that is pretended for the *inſtitution*, the *edict* of the *Emperour* for the *Univerſal obſervation* of it is very *reconcileable* with that, (and ſo alſo with the *uſage* of the *firſt ages* after the *Apoſtles* in caſe it be divolved no *higher* then theſe, as the ſeveral *decrees* of *Magiſtrates Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical* for an *univerſal* obſervation of the *Lords day* are ſure perfectly reconcileable with the *Apoſtolical original* thereof.

4. And this was there evidenced by the 20000 *Chriſtians* that

were *burnt* by *Diocletian* on this day (sure long before that *edict* of *Iustinus* (at which time saith the* *Historian*, πᾶν τὸ Χριστώνυμον πλῆθος ἐκ πάσης ἡλικίας τῷ νεῷ ἤθροιστο πανηγυρίζοντες τὰ γενέθλια, *all that were called Christians of all ages assembled in the Church to celebrate the nativity*, And to that, it seems he hath no other return, but his *advertisement* that *Nicephorus* saith it was *Maximinus*, that was thus *bloody*, *Maximianus*, I suppose he would have said, who *reigned* with *Diocletian*, and then it comes to the *same* passe, and the truth is acknowledged, which soever the *name* were.

* Niceph: l. 7. c. 6.

5. So against resolving the *day* of this *festival* to be *Decemb.* 25. his proofs are *extraordinary*; 1. from the *Doctor* himself, that it was called *Midwinter day*, which is a *fortnight before*. But that hath already been answered, the variation being *evidenced* to be from the want of *exactnesse* in our *Calendars*, not from any *doubt* of the day.

6. 2dly From the *opinion of many Divines, that our Lord died when he was* 33 *and half years of age, or neer unto* 34, as saith he, *the Doctor saith*, *Qu.*1. §.10. What *Divines* these are that thus *calculate*, I am not told, nor how *competent* they are to be *confronted* to the *censual Tables*, from whence S. *Chrysostome* fetches the *day of his birth*: But the luck of it is, that citation from the *Doctor* was easily *consulted*, and on view of the place, there is no more but this, that *Christ preacht the will of his Father three years or foure together*, which I thought had signified no more then for some *uncertain space betwixt* 3 or 4 *yeears*; And if he were *born* in *December* and *died* in *April*, what difficulty is there in this *calculation?* or what needed the *Diatribist* to have cited from the *Doctor* the words [*neer* 34.] when he knowes there is *nothing* to that *sense* said by him?

7. The 3d thing (without which his undertaking to mention *many*, will be a *faileur*) *which may make us doubt of the truth of the calculation, is the yonger date of the Arabick Codex of the Councels*; But when that *Codex* was dated, he hath not told us, And if it were *later* then I thought, it may yet possibly speak *truth*, and so that will give us no *reason* of *doubting*.

8. His last proof is, that the *Doctor is upon Ifs*, and *Tis probable*, And I heartily wish the *Diatribist* would but speak *probably*, and till

till he doth so, that he would not have such *aversions* to the *Doctors Ifs*, I mean, that he would use *diffidence*, when he pretends not to *demonstrate*.

9. I adde nothing to his *returns* about the *Epiphany*, but leave them to be *judged* by the §§. to which they are *opposed*.

10. And for the large view of the place in *Chrysostome*, and his *dispute* against that *Father*, my *answer* is very brief, that all that I attempted to prove from *Chrysostome*, was the due *timing* of the *feast* on the 25th of *December*, and that being done beyond *controversie*, I pretend not to derive other *decisions* from that *testimonie*, but leave them to stand on their own *basis*.

11. Only when from some words of *Chrysostome*, he at length concludes the *authority* of the *Church* in *constituting, and celebrating this festival in all ages much shaken*, I must reminde him that that *Fathers* words which affirm it a *question* at that time, belong not to the *Festivity* it self, but only to the * *particularity* of the *day*, whether it were to be kept on the 25th of *December* or on some other day, and accordingly his proofs proceed, ὅτι οὗτος ἐστὶν ὁ καιρὸς *that this is the very time*; And though some *doubted* whether this were a *new*, or the ἀρχαία *ancient day of the festivity*, yet saith he, others *defended* it, ὅτι παλαιὰ καὶ ἀρχαία ἐστὶ, καὶ ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Θράκης μέχρι Γαδείρων οἰκοῦσι κατάδηλος καὶ ἐπίσημος γέγονε, *that it was old & antient* (or *original*, so ἀρχαία from ἀρχὴ signifies, and is all one with * *Tertullians quod ab initio*, as that with *quod ab Apostolis*) and from these *ancient*, if not these *first* timas (as ἄνωθεν commonly imports, and so again in * *Tertullian*, *ordo ad originem recensus*) it hath been *manifest and illustrious to all that dwell from Thrace to Gadeira*, from *East* to *West*, that sure with him signifies, all the *world* over.

* Πολὺς περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτας γίνεται λόγος.

* l. 1. contr. Marc. c. 5.

* Ib.

12. And so still this *dispute*, which side soever was in the *right*, is founded in a *supposition* of the *feast* it self being ἀρχαία and ἄνωθεν *original and from the beginning*, And indeed if the *first* proof which he offers for it be considered, tis not imaginable how he should say more to the *asserting* of the *Apostolicalnesse* both of the *Festivity* and the day also.

13. *That this is the season*, saith he, *on which Christ was born, the first demonstration is* τὸ ταχέως οὕτω πανταχοῦ περιαγγελθῆναι καὶ πρὸς ὕψος ἐπιδοῦναι τοσοῦτον, καὶ ἀνθῆσαι τὴν ἑορτὴν, *that the feast was*

so speedily promulgate every where, & ascended to so great an height, & flourisht, adding that *as Gamaliel said of the preaching of the Gospel, that if it were of men it would come to nought, but if of God, ye cannot dissolve it, lest ye be found fighters against God, the same he might say confidently* περὶ ἡμέρας ταύτης *of this day* (not of the *Gospel*, as the *Diatribist* afterward saith, he *thinks he means*, but cannot really do so in this place, against such * expresse words) that ἐπειδὰν ἐκ θεοῦ ἐστι, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μόνον οὐ καλελύθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἐπιδίδωσι καὶ λαμπροτέρα γίνεται, *seeing*, or *because it is from God, therefore tis not only not dissolved, but every year advances, and becomes more splendid*, and yet farther adding (in the words recited by the *Diatribist*, and by omitting the former, rendred *capable* of being *misunderstood*) ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ἐν ὀλίγοις ἔτεσι τὴν πᾶσαν κατέλαβεν οἰκουμένην, καίτοι σκηνοποιῶν, ἁλιέων, ἀγραμμάτων, ἰδιωτῶν πανταχοῦ διακομιζόντων αὐτὸ, *seeing the preaching* (of it certainly, i. e. of the *day*, or else it can have no *coherence* with the *feast* or *antecedents* and whole *contexture*) *in a few years took possession of the whole world, though tentmakers and fishermen, unlearned and idiots brought it amongst them.*

Τούτω καγὼ περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης εἴποοιμι θαῤῥῶν.

14. How farre this is now from doing *prejudice* to the *Universal observation* of this *day* in the *Apostles times*, I leave the *Reader* (and, if he please, the *Diatribist* also) to consider.

Sect. 21.

The Diatribist's answer to my conclusion. Strictures on some passages in it.

1. WHat now remains is by way of *reply* to my *conclusion*, that the *fastidious rejecting or not observing the Festivals of the universal Church must be looks on as an act of affected departure from the universal Church of Christ in all ages, and not only from the reformed Church of* England.

2. *This*, saith he, *is an heavy charge, if it can be proved.* And for that I must now referre my self to the *premisses* in that *treatise* and

and in this defence, not indeed can it be reasonable that I descend to any other way of *probation* or *vindication*, till this which I have used be invalidated; For a *conclusion* being (as this is) deduced from the *premisses*, what more can be required to *establish* the *conclusion*, then the *confirmation* of the *premisses*?

3. And therefore as it is against all *laws* of *Discourse* for the *Diatribist* to confute or *deny*, or make *answer* to the *conclusion*, any otherwise then by *refuting* the *media*, which have *inferred* it; so must it be in me, to *reply* to such *offers* of *answer*, which can never signifie any thing, as long as my *premisses* stand in force, especially if it proceed by *denying* those things, which this *vindication* hath undertaken to prove, without offering *answer* (as without the *spirit* of *divination* it could not) to those *proofs*.

4. For *example*, The *Diatribist* here begins with this *affirmation*, that *I have not proved that the universal Church of the first age hath observed any of the Festivals*, And I have here evidently proved that *Easter* was observed by *Philip* and *John* the *Apostle*, and from them received by the *Asiaticks*, or *Eastern Christians* and so likewise by the *Western* from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, and so sure there is no further need of *refuting* this *affirmation*.

5. And the same might in like manner *appear* in each insuing *step* of his *answer*, and the *rule* by which he is content to be *judged applied* exactly to the *condemning* him in this very business of the *Easter Festivity*, which is of as much force, as if it equally appeared of every other of the *great Festivals*. But still this were to *repeat* what hath here been already said, and *vindicated* from all his *exceptions*.

6. In stead whereof I shall only gather up what hath any thing of *newes* in it. And 1. let me *admire his candor*, when he *will not stick to grant this rule to be good, that whatever doctrine or practice hath the concordant attestation of the Churches of the Apostolical time, while they were yet alive, it was Apostolical*] but withall addes as if he had been too *liberal*, that the *negative is a surer rule to judge by*, (as if indeed any *predication* could be surer then that which is *identical*.)

7. Next his *argument* against the *concordant attestation* of the *primitive ancient* concerning *Apostolical tradition* drawn from *Papias's affirmation* of the *Millenium*, had not, I confesse, formerly been produced, but it falls out that I have * elsewhere sufficently cleared it.

* *Qu.* 1. §. 38. and in *the Def.* of *L.* Falkland's *Tract of Infall.*

8. Thirdly, his citation *p.* 197. from the *Pract. Cat.* p. 181. that *Christmas was not universally solemnized till about* 400 *years after* Christ, and after (a little more to his *advantage*) *till at least the* 400*years*, p. 201.] is both as to the *words* and as to the *sense* very much *misreported*; The place is ready to be seen, and lies thus. *The authority by which this festival stands in the Church, is that of the practice of the Primitive universal Church*, and this made appear 1. from the *immemorial observation* of it, 2. from the *ancient Fathers* speaking of it as an *ancient usage* (in the notion of ἀρχαία even now given) 3. by the *testimonies* not only of the *author* of the *Constitutions* (*ancient* though not *Apostolical*) but of *Origen*, of *Cyprian*, of *Ammianus Marcellinus*, speaking of *Julian* 1300 years since, and mentioning the *Epiphany* as a *known festival* of the *Church*, and so both that, and *Christmasse* of a far greater antiquity, then the time of *Julian*. Lastly, by the words of *Chrysostome*, that *though the particular day* December 25. *was not fixt at* Antioch *till his time, yet from* Rome *over all the* West *it had been so observed from the most ancient records of Christianity*, Upon which my *conclusion* is, that *it appears at least to be an Ecclesiastical constitution very early received over all the* West, *the far greatest part of Christendome, and within* 400 *years universally solemnized, and this a very competent authority, when withall 'tis so probable, that it may be more, according to a* * *rule of the Fathers, That very ancient and general usages, whose beginnings are unknown, may be resolved to be of Apostolical institution or practice* &c.

* *In eis quæ scriptura nec jubet, nec prohibet, illud est sequendum quod consuetudo roboravit, quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit.* Tertull. de coron. milit. *& Quod universa tenet ecclesia, nec conciliis institutum, sed semper retentum est, non nisi potestate Apostolica traditum rectissimè creditur.* Aug. de bapt. con. Donat. l. 4. c. 23.

9. This I have thus *transcribed* from that place, to *demonstrate* what *fidelity* there was in this *citation*, not only in *applying* that to the *Festivall*, which belonged peculiarly to that *particular day Dec.* 25. but also in affirming from me, that *it was not universally solemnized till about* 400. *years* and *till at least the* 400. *years* (which leaves it free to be of a later *date*) when I say *'tis so probable that it was of Apostolicall institution or practice, that the feast of Epiphanie was spoken of, as a known festivall*

long

long before that time, and the feaſt of Innocents, attending this of Chriſtmas affirmed by Origen to be by the holy Fathers according to the will of God commanded to be for ever celebrated in the Church, and onely added, that *it appears to be at leaſt an Eccleſiaſticall inſtitution very early received over all the Weſt, and the farre greater part of Chriſtendome, and within* 400. *years univerſally ſolemnized.*

10. What can be more viſibly *unjuſt* then this? or what heed can be given to *teſtimonies* thus *transformed* into *ſhapes*, which the *writer* never *dream'd* of, and yet from them *concluſions* deduced ſuch as here follow in this place of the *Diatribiſt*, that my *raſh zeale hath carried me beyond the bounds of Reaſon and Religion.*

11. To which *expreſſion* of his all that I have to ſay is, 1. That my *concluſion* was inferred out of *premiſſes*, not *dictated* by *zeale*, 2dly. That it affix'd no cenſure on any *perſon*, belonging onely to thoſe who ſhould be found *guilty* of it, and ſo was wholly deſigned to ends of *charity*, to *reforme*, not to *reproach* any: 3. That if there had been any thing of *raſh*, or *bitter* in it, it might have admoniſht the *Diatribiſt* μὴ ἀξιομισῶδαι, not to be ſo ſoon *guilty* of greater ſharpneſs; As it is, I muſt onely inferre, that it ſeemes the *guilty* perſon hath the *priviledge* of *accuſing* and *judging* in any form of *language*, and ſo I ſhall not be ſo *unſeaſonable* as to *admoniſh* him of the *injuſtice* of it, at a time when it is ſo *improbable* he will reap profit by it.

12. There is now nothing behind but his *faſtidious reflexions* upon *three Quæſtions* which I had return'd to the *Author* of the 16. *Queres*; But becauſe I ſee he likes not the *Quæſtions* in my *termes*, and in his *propoſing* of *foure* others, inſerts *particulars*, wholly rejected by mee, as that of [*parts of worſhip*] adding [*as it is propounded*, §. 9.] (but I hope not by me ſo *propounded*) of *abuſe* to *ſuperſtition* and *profaneneſs*, &c. I ſhall be as little obliged to *accept* them in his *termes* or *tempted* by the *nature* of the *task*, or by the *probability* of the *ſucceſs* of it with this *Diatribiſt*) to begin *new diſputes* at this time; It is not amiſs that we *ſhake hands* for a *while* and *commune* each with *his own heart in ſtillneſs*: And ſo I heartily take my leave of him.

The End.

ERRATA.

Page	Line	Read	Page	Line	Read
1	38	ſo full	152	23	ἀκαθαρσία
3	26	if we		30	dele be
12	3	ſpecies	154	12	place all
14	10	whither with	171	35	פלגת
18	22	without	180	38	on his
24	29	ſuperſtitious	187	4	καταχρήσ.
25	38	deſtructive	192	3	γνωμήν
26	24	νήσους	206	16	41.
38	3	that without	207	35	depredicates
39	8	in it	208	2	& S[1]
42	7	of other	213	20	propoſes
45	11	dele to	224	10	*glorioſè*
48	13	*rerumque*	228	32	it
	25	I ſhall	229	4	dele ,
75	24	worſhips	237	32	ὅσον
80	34	of this	239	38	rendred
83	38	inſtitutione	243	29	downward
86	17	of my ſence	250	2	hither
28	36	על	251	32	reach
108	26	rendring, Theſe	268	18	entrance
109	11	and	272	1	wiſh a
113	3	words	279	7	after be add,
116	6	on mine		17	be it two
117	28	of, not	286	17	whoſe
129	32	מעט		22	think
150	2	Will-deviſed			

p.10. in marg. read χρυσ: ἔπ. p.48. in marg. l. 1r. Chalcidius.
p.131. marg. li. penult. r. οὐδὲν.